DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 912 VT 017 745

TITLE	An Evaluation of Results and Effectiveness of Job Banks: Volume I, Parts I and II.
INSTITUTION	Ultrasystems, Inc., Newport Beach, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Policy, Evaluation, and Research.
PUB DATE	Mar 72
NOTE	71p.; R-MEL-72-02a
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Relations; *Data Bases; *Employment Services; *Federal Programs; Glossaries; Goal Orientation; Man Machine Systems; Manpower Development; *Manpower Needs; Manpower Utilization; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Job Banks

ABSTRACT

In order to assist the Manpower Administration of the U. S. Department of Labor in the planning, development, and expansion of over a hundred computerized "job banks," located in nearly every State, field interviews were conducted with job applicants, employers, Employment Service staff, and community agencies to evaluate the current status of these data based and to make recommendations for program improvement. Positive results achieved by using "job banks" are detailed, and the program itself is delineated. Major program benefits include the introduction of computer technology to manpower service delivery, with its potential for computerized job-matching. Optimizing the "job bank" and its functions is suggested, rather than viewing the whole system as transitional and therefore dismissing its major problems. The impact of local "job banks" on Employment Service goals, Employment Service staff, and on the local community are discussed, noting improvements in managing the Employment Services and other human relations aspects, such as better service to the job-seeker. There is little correlation, however, between program achievements and Employment Service goals. (AG)

ED 069412

Report MEL 72-02a
Contract #83-06-72-01

AN EVALUATION OF RESULTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF JOB BANKS

VOLUME I

PART I: INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

PART II: THE IMPACT OF JOB BANK ON ES GOALS; ES STAFF, AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Ultrasystems, Incorporated
500 Newport Center Drive
Newport Beach, California 96900

March 1972

Prepared for
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
MANPOWER ADMINSTRATION
OFFICE OF POLICY, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210

VT017745

This study was conducted and this report was prepared under contract with the Office of Policy, Evaluation and Research of the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. Organizations undertaking such projects under Government Sponsorship are encouraged to state their findings and express their judgments freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PART I

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

PART I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.0	Introduction	1-1
2.0	General Description of the Job Bank	1-2
	2.1 Objectives and General Description of the System	1-2
	2.2 Organization	1-4
	2.3 History and Method of Implementation . .	1-5
3.0	Methodology and Scope of the Evaluation . . .	1-6
	3.1 Scope of the Evaluation	1-6
	3.2 Methodology of the Evaluation	1-7
4.0	Findings and Conclusions of the Evaluation .	1-8
	4.1 Summary Statement	1-16

Glossary 1-ii

PART II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page 2-i

GLOSSARY

The following acronyms and abbreviations are used throughout the text of this report. Whenever the term is used initially, a definition of it is provided.

ACHESI	Job Order Adjustment And Status Change Form. Name of form used to communicate order status change information within JBC.
AOA	Aged Order Alert. Job Bank Computer Report. List by alpha sequence on employer name those jobs that have been in Job Bank Book longer than a specified number of days. Gives order number, DOT, occup. title, order age, date of order, order status and indication of number of referrals/placements made at last report period and at time of this report.
ARER	Applicant Referral Exception Report. Job Bank Computer Report. List by alpha sequence on employer name all referrals made before an input date for which no outcome date is available. Contains Job Order number, order status, DOT, occup. title, referred applicant name(s), referral date, referral loc-sta-desk and order location (office where order was taken).
ARJ	Applicant Refused Job (referral result code).
CA	Community Agency. Any public or social organization providing services to a community.
CAA	Community Action Agency. An agency funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.
CEP	Concentrated Employment Agency. A Department of Labor work program designed to help the hard-core unemployed.
CI	Central Index. Lists all job orders in DOT sequence with referral/placement activity and order status information. Used to track referral clearnace calls and to input order status changes.

Glossary (continued)

COMO	Comprehensive Model. A Manpower Administration devised Job Bank program providing a self-service option based on a hierarchy of need.
DIS	Disadvantaged. A person, usually a member of a minority, meeting Department of Labor economic and social criteria.
DNH	Disadvantaged Not Hired (used with respect to Ultrasystems sampling of applicants)
DNR	Did Not Report (for interview--result code used in JB operation).
DNR	Disadvantaged Not Referred (used with respect to Ultrasystems sampling of applicants)
DOL	Department of Labor
DOT	Dictionary of Occupational Titles. A publication containing over 20,000 occupational titles and descriptions.
ED	Employability Development. An Employment Service unit designed to provide numerous services to the non-job ready applicant.
EDP	Electronic Data Processing
EEA	Emergency Employment Act. The government's newest manpower program signed into law July 12, 1971. Provides funds to cities when certain levels of unemployment are reached.
EOA	Economic Opportunity Act
ERR	Employer Relations Representative. An Employment Service staff member.
ES	Employment Service. A State public employment agency.
ESARS	Employment Security Automated Reporting System. A reporting system used to collect applicant characteristics within the network of public employment agencies.

Glossary (continued)

FP	Failed Physical (referral result code)
FRW	Failed to report to work (referral result code)
FP	Failed Physical (referral result code)
H&RB	Hold and Referred (Job Bank) Book--Job Bank Computer Report. List of all Job Orders on hold and on referred hold.
HOR	Hired Other Referral (referral result code)
HRD	Human Resources Development (generally applied in this report to individuals who are hard-core unemployed)
ICCS	Index Central Control Sheet (same as CI)
IN/OUT Order	An order taken by a Placement Interviewer and filled the same day taken (verified filled--applicant has started work)
IJS	Individual Job Solicitation--A job opening developed or requested for a particular applicant.
IO	Industrial Office. Special type of Local Office. An Employment office specializing in industrial occupations.
KP	Keypunch
KT	Key tape
JB	Job Bank. A computer-assisted compendium of job orders.
JBB	Job Bank Book (used interchangeably with Open Order List). List of all open orders.
JBC	Job Bank Central. Organization within ES created to handle Job Bank. Does order taking, referral control, referral verification, order status control, maintains files of orders and referrals, and handles all source documents for EDP.

Glossary (continued)

JBOR	Job Bank Operations Review. Statistical tables reflecting order activities.
JD	Job Development (refers to developing orders with no particular applicant in mind).
JIS	Job Information Service. A Job Bank unit providing self-service to applicants.
JO	Job Order--form used to write up an order.
LMA	Labor Market Area. A geographic area of responsibility having similar characteristics.
LO	Local Office. An Employment Service office.
MAJOR	Name given to Central Index for one JB opening.
MDTA	Manpower Development and Training Act
MI	Master Index (used interchangeably with Central Index: CI).
NAB	National Alliance of Businessmen
NABS-JOBS	Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. A Department of Labor funded program utilizing business executives to foster and develop job opportunities for the hard-core-unemployed.
NH	Not Hired (referral result code).
NH-JF	Not Hired-Job Filled (referral result code)
NQ	Not Qualified (referral result code)
NYC	Neighborhood Youth Corps. A Department of Labor funded work experience program for disadvantaged youth, 16-19 years old.
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity. An agency created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.
OJT	On-the-Job Training

Glossary (continued)

ORR	Outstanding Referral Report--Job Bank Report listing all unverified referrals in system (alpha sequenced by employer name).
OT	Order Taker--person in JBC who takes orders.
OTV	Order Taker and Verifier--person in JBC who takes orders and verifies referrals.
OTW	Other-than-white
PI	Placement Interviewer. An Employment Service staff member involved in interviewing and referring applicants to jobs.
QC	Quality Control
QNS	Qualified Not Selected (referral result code)
RA	Referrals Allowed (refers to referral limit established on job order)
RM	Referrals Made (refers to tally of referral clearance calls in CI)
RMA	Regional Manpower Administrator. Any of 12 Department of Labor Administrators having jurisdiction over a specific area.
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification. A numeric code classification by industry.
SMSA	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. A specific area, usually based by city and/or county.
STEP	Supplementary Training and Employment Program
UC	Unemployment Compensation. Unemployment benefits provided workers who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own.
UI	Unemployment Insurance

Glossary (continued)

USTES	United States Training and Employment Service. An organizational unit within the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration.
VER	Veterans Employment Representative (also used to refer to ES operations involving veterans' services in the local office).
WIN	Work Incentive Program. A special program designed to assist welfare recipients.
YOC	Youth Opportunities Center. A department within many Employment Service agencies specializing in youth placement services.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

An eight-month study and evaluation of the results and effectiveness of Job Banks was begun in late July 1971 by Ultrasystems, Inc. in order to assist further the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor in the planning, development, and expansion of this new Employment Service tool. The evaluation encompasses review and analysis of previous studies and data collected, internal and external to the Department of Labor, and collection and analysis of new quantitative and qualitative information through site visits to fifteen Job Bank cities.

The Department of Labor has done extremely well in meeting the time table for Job Bank installations, and the Employment Service through its State operating agencies has established well over one hundred functioning Job Banks distributed in almost every State in the nation. The fifteen cities and States which were the focus of this evaluation are located in DOL Regions I through VII, with at least two cities in each region except III. At the time of the field investigation, the Job Banks ranged in age from nine months to thirty months and served work force populations of from 3,313,000 (Chicago) to 129,000 (Mobile). A classic field data collection process was utilized with personal interviews conducted with job applicants, employers, Employment Service staff, and community agencies.

The evaluation was begun with the basic philosophy that there would be no attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the Employment Service in the cities visited but, rather, to concentrate on the Job Banks themselves, their operational characteristics and peculiarities and their unique effectiveness and impact on the Employment Service functions of which they are an integral part. This is a critical concept for the understanding and utilization of the findings and conclusions presented in this report. It is not reasonable to assign solely to a Job Bank the changes in Employment Service activity over a period of time subsequent to a Job Bank installation without having done an extensive examination of every facet of Employment Service operations in that city before and after the Job Bank was implemented. For this evaluation, city visits were conducted for a duration of one week, and an attempt was made in each case to derive a snapshot picture of the way a Job Bank was functioning and how it was being used and to collect as much history and opinion as possible of how that implementation had affected previous modes and quality of operation.

Two other critical factors require rigorous consideration in interpreting and using the findings of this evaluation. Firstly, it is clear that no matter how standardized the basic Job Bank

software and procedures might be in concept and actuality, the Job Bank implementation process in every city visited took place in different ways and required adjustment in processes, internal and external to the Job Bank, by Employment Service staff and other users commensurate with local environment, nature of previous operations, and other local phenomena. Secondly, in most of the cities visited, the institution of ESARS, generally concurrent with a significant portion of the life period of the Job Bank in a subject city, had created problems and additional changes to the "normal" order of things, and thus made Job Bank impact assessment even more difficult.

Another corollary consideration has to do with the relative permanence of the establishment of a Job Bank in a given city. In an overall sense, the installation of Job Banks in dozens of cities has taken place in almost crescendo fashion in response to a Presidential mandate. As with any revolutionary, reasonably sophisticated, and rapid developmental process, unpredicted phenomena took place, mistakes were made, and reparational and corrective actions were formulated and implemented as rapidly as possible. Experience with the system also led to essential or desirable improvements either in the substance of the system or its method of use. These modifications, whether of an essential or "product improvement" nature, have been implemented in a sequence and fashion mostly, but not always, dictated by the status and capacity of individual city Job Banks to absorb them. The resulting variations in Job Bank characteristics and process from city to city call for some caution in drawing comparative conclusions or developing generalized findings of useful validity.

With these considerations in mind, it is felt that the Job Bank evaluation has generated findings and conclusions which provide current and valid insight into the effectiveness and acceptance of Job Banks as perceived by their operators and users as well as the evaluating group. Perhaps more importantly, this evaluation report, through its conclusions, should stimulate Manpower Administration and State and local Employment Service planners with ideas and concepts for improving or restoring performance in a general sense and providing dissemination to State and local level of successful local solutions to problems of more general and pervasive nature.

2.0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE JOB BANK

2.1 Objectives and General Description of the System

An operating Job Bank is a simple device, but it has wide ranging implications. It involves the use by the Employment Service of

a computer into which Job Orders are fed as they are received by local offices and the generation by that computer of printouts on a daily basis which list all current orders. These printouts are copied and bound in a book and rapidly distributed each morning to local Employment Service offices and cooperating community agencies. In some cities the same data is first converted to microfiche form and similarly distributed. There is a single-point control, called Job Bank Central in this report, for referral of applicants from the entire service area of the Job Bank to channel jobseekers to employers and to preclude referrals in excessive numbers or to jobs already filled. The implementation of Job Banks has not affected the basic necessity to interview jobseekers in order to determine their individual desires and suitability for available openings. Even in cities where the Job Bank Book is independently available to applicants, specific employer data is suppressed and the applicant must still communicate with ES staff in order to be referred. The primary intent of the Job Bank concept is to provide daily dissemination to the widest possible distribution of all job openings in a given area. The considerable variation in Job Bank characteristics from city to city and the particular differences in the cities which are the subject of this evaluation are extensively discussed in the balance of the report.

To set the stage for the findings of this evaluation, it is necessary to list the three basic goals of Job Banks as originally stated by the Secretary of Labor in his Memorandum of March 1969 to the President:

1. To provide all interviewers of the Employment Service and cooperating agencies with information on all job openings given to those organizations in the metropolitan area;

2. To eliminate excessive and wasteful referrals of workers to employers;

3. To eliminate excessive and wasteful job solicitation visits to employers.

In this evaluation an assessment was also made of the degree of realization achieved of several potential benefits to the Employment Service which were based on experience with the first Job Bank in Baltimore, Maryland, and which were documented in Training and Employment Service Policy Letter (TESPL) 2525 of November 14, 1969:

1. Elimination of competition among manpower agencies, thereby avoiding multiple and duplicative job solicitations;

2. Decentralization of staff into neighborhoods where the target population lives, without loss of control and quality supervision of that staff;

3. An increase in referrals and placement of disadvantaged jobseekers while maintaining volume of total placements;

4. More effective planning, redirection, and coordination of employer relations and job development efforts based on data derived from the Job Bank;

5. An improved system of management and supervisory controls over volume and quality of order taking, selection, referral, and verification by computer printouts of definitive data on qualitative and quantitative bases, on individual interviewers and office and unit performance, on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis;

6. Establishment of a source of current information about jobs and job opportunities for use in job market information, manpower planning, planning for MDTA and vocational education, CAMPS, etc.;

7. An improved level of community acceptance from employers, jobseekers, and the political, social, and economic power structure of the community;

8. Acceptance of Employment Service assistance by inner-city or disadvantaged populations;

9. Creative use of Community Aids in outreach activities;

10. An increase in public relations interest and support for Employment Service programs in all news media;

11. Substantial improvement in Unemployment Insurance operations due to current and specific job market information made available to interviewers to assist them in determining eligibility and providing assistance to claimants in their efforts to find work.

2.2 Organization

The implementation of Job Banks required certain organization and functional changes in State and local offices in order to convert from the previous manual approach of order taking and referral control. The unique changes in the mechanics of operations are

described later, but it is important to realize that there have beer other more subtle changes which are psychological in nature and which have accrued from the conversion of manual to computerized functioning which have generated both predictable and unpredictable human reactions to such changes. The most critical of these and which have led to the greatest impact on workload and personnel organization have been the introduction of new paper forms and data handling processes and the depersonalization of certain relations between ES staff and between that staff and the outside wo ld. The Job Bank, and particularly the Job Bank Central function, has emerged into a definable and generally isolated entity within an Employment Service city operation which is, in the main, accessible only by telephonic contact. At the same time, key to the Job Bank operating philosophy has been the establishment of this central function as the only, and mandatory, control for permission to refer applicants to given Job Orders and for authoritative recording of Job Order status. Thus, the coming of Job Banks has affected the actual personnel organization of the ES as well as the unwritten organization for the chain of actions between Job Order receipt and applicant placement or Job Order cancellation.

2.3 History and Method of Implementation

The first Job Bank went into operation in Baltimore, Maryland in May of 1968. Since that time, at an ever increasing rate, Job Banks became operational in major cities across the country. In addition to individual city installations, effort is under way for establishing statewide Job Bank systems which involve the accessibility of all local offices of the Public Employment Service in a State to a Job Bank. Implicit in this concept is the provision for even greater dissemination of Job Order information through generation and distribution of Job Order information in locations other than the source of the job opening, and thus provide even greater exposure of such openings than on a local basis.

The Department of Labor's implementation of city and statewide systems is considered to be an interim step in the development of a completely automated nationwide applicant and job matching system. The method of implementation being used which will permit comprehensive national exposure to ES personnel of automated manpower service delivery is probably a reasonable sequential step leading to general automated job matching capability. Job Banks are being utilized not only in cities with conventional ES organization and service approaches but in Comprehensive Model (COMO) cities where the Job Bank is an integral and key component of that service delivery approach.

In the meantime, experiments are being conducted in several States in the use of computers for matching new applicants to available jobs or new jobs to available applicants. Related experimentation is taking place in several cities in the development of computer vocabularies for use in job matching processes. An interesting situation will develop in California when Job Banks are implemented in San Francisco and Los Angeles, where computerized job matching, at least for professional jobs, has been in effect for some time. Thus, it is clear that computerization of manpower operations is a continually expanding and very dynamic process which is taking place on an iterative basis, hopefully without degradation of Employment Service "productivity," even temporarily, and under circumstances which permit continuing evaluation and improvement of effectiveness.

3.0 METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

3.1 Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation was structured within a general purpose of assessing the results and effectiveness of Job Banks in order to assist further in their planning, development, and expansion. The scope of effort was bounded by the pre-established number of cities to be visited, which was fifteen. Additionally, the evaluation did not encompass review of Job Bank operations in DOL Regions VIII, IX, and X, although this does not imply that the validity and quality of findings are impeded by this fact. An excellent sample is inherent in the 15 cities of a wide variety of local conditions, methods of Job Bank implementation, and different degrees of maturity of Job Bank operations in the subject cities.

The research design, the associated interview guide development, and the structure and staffing for data collection and analysis were all formulated to support five primary study and evaluation objectives:

A. *To assess the actual achievements of Job Bank operations as compared to stated goals;*

B. *To identify and measure other impacts of the Job Bank on Employment Service operations and results;*

C. *To assess the extent to which State Employment Service agencies and local offices and community agencies are utilizing the full potential of the Job Bank mechanism;*

D. *To identify the attitudes and opinions of employers, jobseekers, the ES staff, and relevant community agencies concerning the Job Bank;*

E. *To investigate the cost implications of Job Bank installation and operations.*

This report presents findings and conclusions in enough detail to reasonably satisfy Objectives A through D above. In the case of Objective E, which has to do with cost analysis of Job Bank installation and operations, serious attempt was made to derive sufficient information at local and State level in order to permit some quantitative measurements of productivity vs. dollars. It was not possible to acquire appropriate data for such an evaluation, not necessarily due to lack of cooperation from solicited individuals, but because of the difficulty of separating out the pertinent funding items from total Employment Service expenditures for such a closely Employment Service-integrated function as Job Bank.

3.2 Methodology of the Evaluation

Very succinctly, this evaluation followed a typical pattern of similar efforts and it was only a little unusual in the necessity to collect a significant amount of field data in a very short period of time. During the initial research design, concurrent review and analysis was made of ongoing studies by the University of Wisconsin and internal efforts by the Manpower Administration. Other historical data on Job Banks was collected and reviewed including the recent Abt Associates evaluation of COMO.

The fifteen-city field investigation process was conducted over a nine-week period, and almost 1600 personal field interviews were conducted using relatively structured questionnaires for the bulk of them. These interviews included over 800 job applicants, half of them at home and half at the Employment Service office, over 400 Employment Service staff people, about 300 employers, and 55 community agencies, all distributed fairly evenly among the fifteen cities.

The analytical process involved simple computerization and breakdown of questionnaire responses and content analysis of open-ended questions. Significant effort was expended, and reported in Section 3 of this report, on detailed examination and study of the Job Bank function as it operates within each city's Employment Service. Particular emphasis was placed on the Central Order Taking and Referral Control process due to their criticality in the overall Job Bank process. Another extensive effort involved computerized manipulation and computerized plot analysis of Job Bank Operations Review (JBOR) data for the fifteen cities prior to and after Job Bank installation. Monthly statistics for an available period of twelve to fifteen months for each city were the subject of intensive review and interpretive attempts in order to probe into quantitative impact on Employment Service transactions

and quality of service before and after Job Banks were installed. The findings of these four basic study areas, existing reports, field investigation, Job Bank Central analysis, and JBOR, were then integrated and cross-correlated where possible for the overall findings of this report.

4.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE EVALUATION

The principal results of this evaluation are presented in this section in two major subsets. First are those findings related to Job Bank performance on a general basis and as observed *vis-a-vis* the evaluation objectives listed on page 1-6. The other set of major findings involves assessing the degree to which Job Bank has met its stated goals as listed on pages 1-3 and 1-4.

It is important to stress that these are only the major findings, but in the separate and pertinent portions of this report they are presented in more detail along with related lower level findings and conclusions. It is also considered appropriate to note that the Job Bank system has evolved rapidly and is a dynamic mechanism and thus its goals, its purpose, its *raison d'etre*, have perhaps also changed both formally and in planners' minds. The goal-related findings in this report do not account for such changes if they exist.

Before addressing the goal-related findings, the first presentation below examines certain aspects of Job Bank results and effectiveness from a somewhat general frame of reference. The following conclusions have crystallized from this perspective of evaluation:

1. Job Banks consistently are doing more efficiently and on a better organized basis certain basic tasks in Job Order processing and Referral Control than was previously possible before Job Bank inception.

2. The Job Bank concept provides an excellent management information system for use at local, state, and even national level, for its own evaluation as well as contribution to overall Employment Service performance accountability. With some modifications and properly coupled with ESARS, the Job Bank statistical reporting capability can also provide an excellent tool for management visibility into overall Employment Service operations. Its data options, though not generally exploited to date, have a significant potential for study and research at local level, in order to improve Employment Service quality.

3. In cities with a self-service Job Bank mode, job applicants for the first time have an independent insight into the specifics of the available job market. This makes for a more positive attitude towards the Employment Service and they expresssed in interviews beneficial feelings of direct participation and involvement in the initial portion of the jobseeking process.

4. Community agencies in the cities visited, whether officially or unofficially cooperating with the Employment Service in the Job Bank system, are not yet deriving all potential benefits from the Job Bank and agency personnel do not view the Job Bank system as supportive of their goals and needs. How much of this negative reaction is aimed at the Employment Service as a whole, as opposed to the Job Bank itself, is difficult to identify. It is clear, however, that in most cities there still exists a distinct spirit of competition between those agencies and the Employment Service for exploiting job opportunities. Additionally, there is not enough understanding at the working level of both the mutuality and the differences in goals in serving unemployed and underemployed disadvantaged and minorities by the ES and CA's. Also, the pervasive problem of inadequate training found with Employment Service staff is even more prevalent within the organizationally more distant community agencies and much work yet remains to be done to bring about in-depth cooperation between the Employment Service and the community agencies so that the Job Bank tool can realize one of its important purposes of service outside of Employment Service facilities.

5. Whether programmed to do so or not, Job Banks have, for the first time on a large scale, broken the traditional relationship between the Employment Service and employers and forced, by the very nature of Job Bank implementation and operating philosophy, a critical group of Employment Service staff to focus on the applicant and his needs.

6. It is critical to the success of the Job Bank system that all actors in the system want and desire to interact with it and see that interaction as being in their best interest. Ultrasystems found a prevailing negative image of certain Job Bank procedures to staff outside of Job Bank Central who view Job Bank Central as an entity demanding previously unnecessary man-hours of input effort and possessing an imperious and impersonal communication approach. A new and reasonably tangible motivational or reward system appears necessary to restructure attitudes of these key staff people

who accept the system as *fait accompli* and want to work with it but are unhappy about certain of its aspects.

7. Even allowing for veteran preferences, NABS, categorical program priorities and other policy or practice limitations, Job Banks offer the potential for more equitable Job Order exposure to all applicants than ever before. This apparent benefit to applicants has some drawbacks which need resolution. The decreased communication with employers on the part of applicant contact personnel, as a result of Job Bank procedures and operating rules which increase applicant exposure, also, in the opinion of ES staff, degrades the quality of personalized service available to the applicant. In addition they have been given little guidance or alternatives on how to cope with their altered functional modes without degrading their service to the jobseeker. Ultrasystems feels that review of alternatives, consistent with Job Bank procedures, to the traditional reward system of placement credit, rapid referral results feedback and personal involvement in the total placement process, might provide ideas for better motivation of ES staff and a resulting better attitude toward optimizing service to the applicant.

8. Many official and unofficial expectations of a major positive effect of Job Banks on basic Employment Service productivity measures, such as Job Order quantity, placement ratios, and the like, have not been realized and perhaps would not have been postulated if there had been a clear understanding of how the Job Bank role would evolve within the Employment Service. It is solely an operating tool and, as designed and presently installed, can only assist with, but not of itself create or fill, job opportunities for ES clients.

9. In general, the main users of Job Bank, employers and job applicants, have not perceived particular change in the quality of service from the Employment Service in the cities visited. Employment Service staff, though they have accepted Job Bank and are trying to work with it, perceive much change, not only in procedures but in the necessity to produce paperwork and contribute to statistical tasks without feedback to them on purpose or potential benefit to their role. Thus, Job Bank, and in particular the Job Bank Central function, has become a scapegoat for their problems, and they do not perceive the apparently unchanged quality of service as do employers and applicants. Venting of frustration with certain operating aspects of Job Bank Central has led the staff to develop system-circumvention techniques and lose many manhours in checking the accuracy of the system with manually derived data.

It is possible that a closer look at this difference in perception of change between users and operators might disclose unexploited potential for improvement of service and clues for its realization.

10. A consistent pattern of inadequate staff and cooperating agency training before and after Job Bank installation was found in almost every city visited. This is not unexpected in a rapidly deployed system, but the unfavorable effect of insufficient training was exacerbated by the lack of preparation of staff for the attendant changes to institutionalized functions that result from Job Bank implementation. Further related effects were found as the result of the continuing improvement modifications to the system which impact procedures and data requirements and the necessity to integrate and correlate data handling with ESARS input needs.

11. Job Bank installations have mandated certain "law and order" steps in improving subsystems of the Employment Service processes such as updating employer files, accurate completion of referral transaction information, reorganization of applicant files, and the like. Too often, this did not, but should have, taken place in advance of the Job Bank operational date.

12. Employment Service management in all cities indicated that most of the significant public and community relations effort had taken place with regard to Job Bank at the time of its inception. On a continuing basis, ERR's have been "selling" the Employment Service with Job Bank as a beneficial and attractive feature. This effort, however, has not been accompanied by a rigorous effort to acquaint those same employers with the benefit to their self-interest in rapidly feeding back their action on referred applicants, which is so critical to the overall concept and to continuing good service.

13. The movement toward statewide Job Bank implementation needs further controlled experimentation and study in detail. The combination of factors such as low-paying jobs, lack of transportation, employer requests for local residents, etc., mitigate the potential benefit of a Job Bank concept which relies heavily on the mobility of work force. Job Bank is a step forward, in many ways, in providing job opportunities on a wider scale. It must be supported, however, by concurrent efforts to develop good quality jobs and the means of getting to them in order to optimize employment service to applicants.

The major findings with respect to the three primary Job Bank goals are:

1. The Job Bank system is meeting its goal of dissemination of Job Order information to Employment Service offices on an overall basis. Still excepted from this dissemination are those Job Orders withheld from the system or limited in exposure (WIN, NABS, Veterans Preference, etc.), and the concept of greater exposure is also inhibited by limited but geographically pervasive individual order pocketing.

   There is no uniform pattern to the way job opening information is being disseminated to cooperating agencies in the cities visited. In the main, job openings developed by such agencies are not introduced into the Job Bank system. Where Employment Service outreach functions are housed within such agencies, different degrees of cooperation and use of the Job Bank system were found.

2. The Job Bank concept, by its very nature, increases the probability of unnecessary referrals due to the wider dissemination of Job Order information. Thus the goal of elimination of such referrals is probably unrealistic. However, Ultrasystems found in almost every city what appear to be quite specific control methods and procedures that have been set up to work this problem. Methods vary and control, in some cities, is loose and at times appears excessive. What seems needed is an assessment by each city of the depth of its problem and determination of true employer feelings about the issue so that referral control philosophies can be "customized" to suit city needs. Interviewing on this evaluation indicated that perhaps the problem does not even exist, or perhaps the control philosophies are quite effective in the cities visited, at least as far as precluding referral excess.

3. Although it is a stated goal of the Job Bank concept to eliminate excessive and wasteful job solicitation visits to employers, there was no specific attempt by Job Bank procedures to control or limit such solicitation in any of the cities visited. Employers interviewed did not consider present job solicitation efforts by public agencies excessive at all. This suggests that, except from the standpoint of efficiency, this goal is perhaps not really necessary and may be inhibiting solicitation efforts. There is also evidence that in the concern for reducing unnecessary referrals those mandates set up against employer contact by staff for referral status or verification have inhibited previous

patterns of job development. One positive way of exploiting Job Bank in this regard (solicitation efficiency) would be for ERR's to utilize the Job Bank Book as a way to gain visibility into employer interests. Such planning approaches were not observed in the cities visited.

Presented below are the findings associated with the secondary "goals" as listed on pages 1-3 and 1-4 and as originally documented in November of 1969 by the Department of Labor. Again, related findings in greater detail are in appropriate sections of the report but these are the major level results:

1. *Elimination of competition among manpower agencies, thereby avoiding multiple and duplicative job solicitations;*

   No indications were found of limitations or elimination of competition between manpower agencies as a result of Job Bank system installation. The Job Banks in the cities visited make no attempt within their operating procedures to limit or eliminate job solicitation efforts by manpower agencies in those cities. Such efforts have probably increased for the Job Bank Book listed employers due to greater dissemination of their Job Order activity but no data was found that a problem exists.

2. *Decentralization of staff into neighborhoods where the target population lives, without loss of control and quality supervision of that staff;*

   It so happened that decentralization in the cities visited had mostly taken place before Job Bank inception. Thus, nothing specific can be said regarding Job Bank bringing decentralization about. However, Job Bank has impacted decentralization, generally to its benefit, but with some attendant problems mostly from logistics conflicts with Job Bank procedures and daily deadlines. There were no prevalent patterns found of staff dissemination approaches and, in general, decentralized staff follows standard ES and specific Job Bank procedures.

3. *An increase in referrals and placement of disadvantaged jobseekers while maintaining volume of total placements;*

Seven of the fifteen cities visited displayed definite progress in increased referrals and placement of disadvantaged jobseekers since Job Bank installation. One large city in particular, with a very active community agency participation, showed a dramatic increase after Job Bank operations began. Whether totally attributable to Job Bank or not, the results are conclusive and tend to reinforce the equitable exposure philosophy of Job Bank, particularly where there is good cooperation with community agencies.

4. *More effective planning, redirection, and coordination of employer relations and job development efforts based on data derived from the Job Bank;*

   No important indications were found of any effects on planning or coordination of employer relations as a result of Job Bank installation and the resulting derived data. This was perceived by Ultrasystems as being due primarily to: (1) staff being involved with operations and modification-associated problems, (2) data normally generated by Job Bank being inappropriate for this purpose, or, (3) lack of interest.

5. *An improved system of management and supervisory controls over volume and quality of order taking, selection, referral, and verification by computer printouts of definitive data on qualitative and quantitative bases, on individual interviewers and office and unit performance, on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis;*

   In all cities visited, Job Banks have provided the means for an improved system of management and supervisory controls over volume and quality of order taking, selection, referral, and verification of Employment Service transactions on qualitative and quantitative bases through computer printouts. This definitive data is also assisting with assessment of individual interviewers, office and unit performance on at least a daily basis. However, the bulk of the available data is not being used for management decisions and control purposes, primarily due to inappropriate data format, inadequate staff training in its use, and lack of staff time for proper assimilation.

6. *Establishment of a source of current information about jobs and job opportunities for use in job market information, manpower planning, planning for MDTA and vocational education, CAMPS, etc.;*

The Job Bank data system includes a source of current information about jobs and job opportunities which can be used for job market information, manpower planning, planning for MDTA and vocational education, CAMPS, etc. Additional effort is still required to present such data for optimal use by these activities and, at present, there is no organized distributing system for this data to potential users.

7. *An improved level of community acceptance from employers, jobseekers, and the political, social, and economic power structure of the community;*

The only positive evidence of this factor was found in cities where individual applicants have independent access to the Job Bank Book and there is "self-service." This self-service concept has met with favorable response from jobseekers. Otherwise, jobseekers in nonself-service cities, other Employment Service users, and those interested community elements which were contacted, demonstrated a very low level of awareness of Job Banks, and, although not probed to any extent by this evaluation, there does not appear to be any measurable increase in community acceptance of the Employment Service since Job Bank inception in the cities visited.

8. *Acceptance of Employment Service assistance by inner-city or disadvantaged populations;*

9. *Creative use of Community Aides in outreach activities;*

10. *An increase in public relations interest and support for Employment Service programs in all news media;*

11. *Substantial improvement in Unemployment Insurance operations due to current and specific job market information made available to interviewers to assist them in determining eligibility and providing assistance to claimants in their efforts to find work.*

With regard to the above four possible "fallouts" of Job Bank, there was no substantive information collected or evidence discovered that would validate their realization in the cities visited. Experimental efforts were found in several cities where Job Bank lists are being used as a convenient source of referral information for the UI client. Though there was not an intensive effort

to investigate the possible achievement implicit in goals 8, 9 and 10, it would appear the Job Bank has not brought about obvious results in those areas.

4.1 Summary Statement

It is fair to ask of the evaluation team at this point in the report: "Putting it all together, what do you think about Job Bank? Is it good or bad"? This is not a question that should or can be answered easily and simply. But we will try.

We believe the Job Bank system is working quite well and doing most of what it is capable of doing. Considering its present maturity and the rapidity of implementation, Job Bank's scope and nature of problems and its thus far unexploited capability are not unreasonable.

It is also felt that Job Bank has made two very important contributions thus far to the Employment Service. They are the reasonably painless break-in of widespread technology utilization it has brought about into manpower service delivery and, corollary to that, the stage setting for computerized job-matching.

However, realistic policy makers and planners know that even massive infusion of pure technology into the Employment Service cannot substitute for overall quality of service in which the human element is mandatory. They also realize that there will always be the pressure for more placements/dollar which implies more service without increase in staff or facilities. Thus, there is a demand for efficiency and, as a result, a very strong ES marketing job is required with employers to compete for their personnel recruiting interests and resources so as to augment ES productivity and optimize the placement to dollars ratio. Hopefully, this can be done in a fashion that is equitable, humanistic, and truly a service to jobseekers.

What does this mean to Job Banks as they are today? We have concluded that they are working well and usefully, but not perfectly or optimally. Now let us look at the next lower level of conclusions. The major findings presented in this initial section of the report, coupled with the detailed information and findings presented in the following sections of this report, can be examined from two points of view:

1. The Job Bank system as it exists today will be around for a few years and thus its failings should be corrected by

any convenient means and effort should be expended to optimize the exploitation of its inherent capabilities to improve Employment Service quality.

2. The Job Bank system of today is a transitional thing, moving towards statewide systems, better integration with improving ESAR's and eventually being phased out by an as yet undefined job-matching system and major attention to its problems is not called for.

We suggest that premise (1) above is proper and (2) is wrong and unrealistic. Within the limits of the study scope, a serious attempt was made to assess the evaluation findings and the implicit and actual recommendations of individuals interviewed in the field in order to determine whether those findings which are unfavorable should perhaps not lead to corrective action, if the Job Banks of today are truly "transitional." It has been generally concluded by Ultrasystems that the problems identified do merit expeditious correction and steps toward achieving unrealized potential of Job Banks make sense as soon as programmable and fundable. This is considered appropriate for two reasons. In the first place, it has taken about four years to develop and install the Job Bank system as it is today. It is good, it is useful, but it has problems and has not reached its full potential. The investment to optimize it in its present form appears reasonable if one assigns another three to four years before computerized job-matching is a national or more limited reality. In the second place, the revolutionary concept of introducing computerized techniques for operating functions of the Employment Service has begun with Job Bank. The concept should be given the opportunity to achieve the widest possible exposure and this exposure should be on the best possible terms; i.e., in a success mode. This consideration would similarly mandate the additional investment for optimizing the system, even in its "transitional" image. There will always be losses of investment in any developmental effort as usage and inventiveness lead to change and improvement. In the case of Job Bank, the major commitment has apparently been made; it seems the wiser path to refine its capabilities, and exploit it to the fullest unless the next major change in Employment Service approach is imminent and incompatible with the Job Bank system when it is optimized.

PART II

THE IMPACT OF JOB BANK
ON ES GOALS, ES STAFF, AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

PART II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.0	Introduction	2-1
2.0	Job Bank Impact on Employment Service Goals .	2-4
	2.1 Intra-Job Bank Coordination	2-4
	2.1.1 Job Order Distribution in the Community	2-4
	2.1.2 Ease of Use of the Job Bank Book	2-6
	2.1.3 Job Order Sharing by CA's	2-6
	2.1.4 Frequency of CA-Job Bank Activity	2-7
	2.1.5 WIN and CEP	2-8
	2.1.6 Conclusions	2-8
	2.2 Employer Relations	2-9
	2.2.1 Duplicative Attempts to Develop Job Openings	2-9
	2.2.2 Solicitation Levels	2-10
	2.2.3 Awareness of the System	2-12
	2.2.4 Additional Findings	2-12
	2.2.5 Conclusions	2-14
	2.3 Referral Control	2-14
3.0	Impact on Selected Problems	2-16
	3.1 Employer Communications	2-16
	3.2 Decentralization	2-16
4.0	Impact on Individuals and Organizations . . .	2-19
	4.1 Employers	2-19
	4.1.1 Awareness of the Job Bank	2-19
	4.1.2 Creation or Alleviation of Employer Complaints	2-20
	4.1.3 Reactions to Job Bank	2-24
	4.1.4 Requests for Service	2-24

PART II

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Section		Page
4.2	Impact on Community Agencies	2-24
	4.2.1 Community Agency Acceptance of Job Bank	2-24
	4.2.2 Perception of the Job Bank	2-26
	4.2.3 Community Agency Suggestions	2-27
4.3	Impact on ES and Staff	2-27
	4.3.1 Personnel Problems	2-28
	4.3.2 Staff Perception of the Job Bank . . .	2-29
	4.3.3 Training	2-31
	4.3.4 Adjustment to Job Bank	2-31
	4.3.5 Staff Suggestions for Improvements . .	2-33
	4.3.6 Other Staff Uses of Job Bank	2-33
4.4	Applicants.	2-33
	4.4.1 Quality of Service	2-34
	4.4.2 Analysis of Applicant Sample	2-36
	4.4.3 Awareness of Job Bank	2-37
	4.4.4 Conclusions	2-37

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	15 City Sample	2-2
2.2	12 Month Placements by Wage Rate	2-38
2.3	15 Job Bank City Summary of Job Orders Received	2-39

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Since the passage of the enabling legislation creating the Federal-State Employment Service system almost forty years ago, the Employment Service has had the primary responsibility for helping workers find jobs and filling employer labor requirements.

Through the intervening years since the establishment of the network, the country's labor force went through some rather dramatic changes. For one thing, the unemployment rate which peaked out at 24.9 percent in 1933, came down to as low as 3.5 percent in 1969. The technological and economic advancements which literally transformed the character of the American people had little effect on Employment Service operations.

But change was soon to affect the Employment Service. The social and manpower legislation of the early 1960's attempted to deal with some of these problems. The Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act were legislative acts aimed at providing training and eliminating the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty. Numerous experiments were conducted, among which was the Department of Labor's experiment to computerize job placement activities of the Employment Service.

Basically, what the Department of Labor sought to do was to utilize modern technology, i.e., the computer, in an effort to increase Employment Service efficiency and effectiveness. In one experiment, in Baltimore, the computer provided a labor-saving method for the collection, dissemination, and control of current job information. The Baltimore experiment of May 1968 proved sufficiently successful that after one year the testing of Job Bank was expanded.

The Job Bank concept was implemented in eight additional cities in 1969. Gradually, the system was introduced in other cities. The apparent success reached such dimensions that at the present time there are more than a hundred Job Banks throughout the country utilizing computers to assist in the placement processes of the Employment Service. The system is no longer experimental.

This report provides an initial look at the Job Bank system. The evaluation included fifteen Job Bank cities, where staff, employers, applicants, and community agency personnel were interviewed. Operational statistics and reports from prior Job Bank studies were collected and studied. Table 2-1 provides a brief description of the cities included in the study. For more detailed information regarding the sample and sampling procedures, see Appendix A, Methodology, of this report.

TABLE 2.1 15 CITY SAMPLE

CITY	DOL REGION	LABOR MARKET					EMPLOYMENT SERVICE REFERRAL TRANSACTIONS[3]			JOB BANK			
		POPULATION[1]		WORK FORCE(000)[2]	UNEMPLOYMENT[2]		AVG/MONTH	% OTW	% DIS.	START DATE	AGE (MO.)	SELF SERVICE	MEDIA
		TOTAL	% OTW		RATE	CLASS.							
MOBILE	(IV)	376,690	30.2	129.1	6.0	C	1079	61	33	12-70	9	NO	HARD COPY
LITTLE ROCK	(VI)	287,189	20.9	142.8	3.2	C	3534	33	32	6-70	15	NO	FICHE
HARTFORD	(I)	663,891	8.1	370.6	6.6	D	2346	41	30	3-69	30	YES	HARD COPY
CHICAGO	(V)	6,978,947	18.7	3313.6	4.3	C	12343	78	44	10-69	23	NO	FICHE
DES MOINES	(VII)	286,101	4.6	148.8	3.4	C	2303	13	14	6-70	15	YES	FICHE
TOPEKA	(VII)	155,322	8.3	INA	INA	INA	2279	18	8	1-71	8	YES	FICHE
MINN/ST. PAUL	(V)	1,813,647	2.8	882.7	4.7	C	5364	17	12	3-70	18	NO	FILM
OMAHA	(VII)	540,142	7.4	246.8	3.9	C	1330	33	19	6-70	15	YES	FICHE
PATERSON	(II)	1,358,794	6.1	610.7	6.8	D	2256	51	35	7-70	14	NO	FILM
BUFFALO	(II)	1,349,211	8.8	572.7	6.2	D	3014	38	31	6-70	15	YES	HARD COPY
GREENSBORO	(IV)	288,590	22.5	321.5	3.5	C	1662	42	13	6-70	15	NO	FILM
COLUMBUS	(V)	916,228	12.0	429.0	2.6	C	2896	45	25	3-70	18	NO	FICHE
OKLAHOMA CITY	(VI)	640,889	10.9	308.3	4.2	C	4875	34	18	6-70	15	NO	FICHE
PHILADELPHIA	(III)	4,817,914	18.1	2128.6	5.9	C	4603	82	25	4-70	17	YES	FICHE
PROVIDENCE	(I)	789,186	3.2	409.1	6.9	D	3451	10	10	9-70	12	NO	HARD COPY

SOURCE:

1. 1970 CENSUS
2. DOL: AREA TRENDS FOR MAY 1971
3. ANALYSIS OF JOB BANK OPERATIONAL REVIEW (JBOR) DATA

KEY:

OTW - OTHER THAN WHITE

DIS. - DISADVANTAGED

CLASS. - CLASSIFICATION
C - MODERATE UNEMPLOYMENT (3.0 - 5.9%)
D - SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT (6.0 - 8.9%)

AGE - AS OF SEPT. 1971

INA - INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE

Job Bank created numerous new activities as well as a new entity. This new entity or functional unit is called "Job Bank Central." This was a major change and the only feature which had a significant impact on ES operations. The philosophies, operations, and implications of Job Bank Central are discussed in meticulous detail in Part III, Job Bank Central Analysis, of this report.

Part IV provides an analysis of JBOR statistics and ties the separate analyses found in this Part and Part III together. It also presents additional results and conclusions based on this analysis.

This Part will provide a subjective assessment of Job Bank's impact on local operations. Its achievements will be compared to the three major Job Bank goals. This will be followed by discussions of Job Bank's influence in solving selected problems, and, finally, Job Bank's impact upon the various actors affected by the system will be examined.

Either Job Bank and its implications are not understood very well by the organizations using it, or else the philosophies necessary to exploit it fully do not exist in the cities sampled. Whichever the case may be, Job Bank has been absorbed into the ES system as a sort of clerical function. Many small changes have occurred, but except for Job Bank Central, the changes have had only a moderate impact on local office organization and procedures. Thus, Part III will contain the major discussion of Job Bank's impact on organization and procedures.

2.0 JOB BANK IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT SERVICE GOALS

2.1 Intra-Job Bank Coordination

The first explicit goal of the Job Bank system is:

> ". . . to provide all interviewers of the Employment Service and cooperating agencies with information on all job openings given to those organizations in the metropolitan area."

The goal statement has been interpreted to mean that the local public Employment Service will conduct a survey of the community to determine what agencies, public and private, are concerned with manpower services. Further, that they will be asked to participate in the Job Bank system subject to certain conditions. These conditions are designed to insure compliance with ES and federal regulations and system rules. The basic ones involve client fees (none), minimum wages, and discrimination. System rules include the entering of all community agency-developed job orders into the Job Bank, compliance with system procedures, completion of requisite forms, and adherence to referral requirements.

This interpretation also places a burden on the local ES offices to act in good faith in complying with these objectives. Thus, it is assumed that the local ES will actively solicit participation by related manpower agencies and that it will work to remove obstacles in order to elicit cooperation.

2.1.1 Job Order Distribution in the Community

Local ES offices adhered to a distribution pattern that by now can be considered traditional. If a rule were to be developed to describe Job Bank's pattern in the community, it would be "retain the same relationships the local ES had before the installation of Job Bank."

The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) network, as the name implies, was federally funded to undertake area manpower planning. All public agencies involved in manpower programs are members, and yet this group, as an entity, was not involved in planning or establishing criteria for cooperating agencies. Ordinarily, the local CAMPS is supposed to approve all area manpower programs. However, Ultrasystems interviewers did not find evidence that approval was sought. CAMPS minutes in several cities revealed very little Job Bank detail or discussion. Furthermore,

local ES offices did not attempt to redefine what agencies were to be considered as qualified users of the system. Thus, for example, a private welfare service agency, that performed rehabilitation, training, and some placement would not be offered direct participation in Job Bank. The agency could not under these conditions even consider participating in Job Bank, since it was never offered the opportunity to participate.

Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO)-sponsored Community Action Agencies (CAA's) were offered use of the Job Bank only if the local ES chose to recognize the CAA. Even where the CAA was recognized, the distribution was questionable. In several cities, for example, the CAA version of the Job Bank Book had the employer identification suppressed. In several other cities, the local ES had established an outstation in the CAA premises, and only the outstationed ES personnel, technically, had access to the Job Bank Book. This procedure is an inexpensive way of establishing an outstation, since it shares the costs of operations with other agencies. It inhibits the distribution of Job Bank into the community. This obligates the local ES to pay the outstation staff's salaries. Wider distribution of Job Bank could occur if the ES used this money to train CAA staff.

Other community agencies had similar access to the Job Bank Book. We found cities in which the Job Bank Book had been distributed to organizations such as the Urban Coalition, the Workers Defense League, JEVS, and OIC. This distribution was subject to the same rules as above. No evidence was found from interviewing to indicate that other organizations such as the Salvation Army, Goodwill Industries, or local welfare departments had been offered the Job Bank Book.

The Job Bank system was not being used as a source of labor market information on a formal, comprehensive basis. Information, such as job trends, geographic job shortages, could not be offered to interested outside manpower or training organizations or to internal programs such as WIN and CEP, unless they did this research, themselves, from the daily Job Bank Lists.

In all fully operational Job Bank cities visited, Job Bank Books were adequately distributed within the local ES operation. All Placement Interviewers (PI's) involved in mainline interviewing and placement were provided with Job Bank lists. Other personnel, such as counselors and Employment Relations Representatives (ERR's) frequently had to share books with other personnel. This distribution, however, was based on frequency of need and was not a serious impediment to the discharge of their responsibilities.

2.1.2 Ease of Use of the Job Bank Book

ES staff and cooperating CA's found the Job Bank Book easy to use. There were complaints about periodic poor quality of the microfiche or microfilm used. A major source of complaint concerned eye strain induced by the viewers. To reduce eye strain, enterprising users fashioned cardboard shields to reduce glare.

Few CA or ES staff personnel complained about the book format. Some expressed preference, such as listing jobs by geographic areas of the city or arranging Job Orders by date.

2.1.3 Job Order Sharing by CA's

Agreements between the ES and CA's required that CA's enter job orders received by them into the Job Bank system. These agreements were not monitored by the ES, and, since analysis of CA job development activity was beyond the scope of this study, we could not obtain statistics as to whether the agreements were being honored by the CA's. Statements by the CA personnel interviewed indicated that most CA-developed orders were not being entered into the system. It appeared that there was ES acquiescence except when there was obvious disregard of the agreement.

One CA's participation was temporarily suspended by the local ES because it would not enter its orders into the system. This CA finally agreed to enter orders, but told our interviewers that it only entered "one-shot" orders. It had developed a "special relationship" with some employers and refused to provide the ES access to their orders. Behind the refusal to engage in full sharing of orders lies a difference in mission. The CA's main objective, in this case, is training; the ES's is placement. The CA nad obtained commitments from employers to hire graduates of their training programs. The CA felt that if it announced these commitments to Job Bank, then there would be no jobs left by the time their trainees graduated. This CA felt that it gained so little advantage from participating in Job Bank that it didn't even bother to send a messenger to pick up its copy of the Job Bank Book.

Other agencies indicated or stated that it was not to their advantage to enter orders into the Job Bank system. Since their job development efforts are on behalf of specific applicant groups who are not generally competitive with the general population served by the ES, the CA's do not feel full participation in the Job Bank will improve their manpower efforts. Indeed, full participation in the Job Bank may violate their chartered mission of specifically

helping target area residents. How, for example, can an Indian and Migrant CAA justify making a tribal job available to the general public, if the Indian tribe it serves has a high unemployment rate? Such problems are similar but less obvious for CAA's, Model Cities Agencies, or other CA's operating in metropolitan ghetto areas.

There are other differences in philosophy which prevent full cooperation between the two agencies. For example, the CAA's recognize that the Job Bank system makes it feasible for the ES to take a more aggressive role with respect to racial discrimination. Job Bank does not collect information in a manner which could be used most effectively against discriminatory employers in ending such practices. The CAA's realize this and do not feel that the ES has become any more relevant to their needs as a result of having Job Bank.

The Job Bank can, in effect, become another weapon for antagonistic agencies to use in their battle against each other. In one such situation, a local ES manager saw the Job Bank as a good way for the CAA to justify its placement activity with "verifiable" statistics. The ES manager, of course, does not realize that the CAA does not need such data to justify its funding. CAA's in similar situations accuse the ES of claiming credit for CAA-contributed orders and placements. Some CAA personnel see the Job Bank as a device which the ES uses to usurp control of their own placement activities.

These are old and relatively invalid arguments, but the point is that the Job Bank can be dragged into them. Job Bank is not a panacea, of course, but the existence of such relationships reduces the possibility that Job Bank will ever achieve its first goal.

2.1.4 Frequency of CA-Job Bank Activity

We were able to count the number of CA-originated orders and placements in each of the Job Bank cities surveyed. If in-and-outs are not counted, this sort of activity represents less than five percent of Job Bank activity in each of the cities surveyed. Since we do not have statistics on CA job development and placement activity from the CA's, the information we do have is only useful to indicate that the CA-Job Bank activity is very low. We cannot even state this with assurance, since some activity occurs from the referral clearance process. The various Job Banks do not keep

detailed records regarding source of referral requests or source of granted referrals (which reduces the total number of referrals permitted on any single order).

2.1.5 WIN and CEP

Although WIN and CEP cannot be actually considered CA's (unless run by a CAA), they share many of the same problems as the CA's. Interviewing was not directed at the WIN and CEP programs, but program staff did get included in the interviewing if they used the Job Bank extensively. Their responses were similar to those expressed by CAA's with respect to the usefulness of the Job Bank as a tool for upgrading or training-related jobs.

2.1.6 Conclusions

1. The local ES offices have made minimal effort to distribute Job Orders or Job Order information into their communities. Job Bank distribution is largely limited to the pre-Job Bank relationships.

2. The Job Bank Books are easy to use. Except for specific minor complaints related in the following sections, there is no impediment with respect to ease of use.

3. CA's are not sharing all of their job orders with the ES. There is very little they can gain by sharing their orders. The full sharing of job orders, in fact, may be an unrealistic goal of the Job Bank system, since the two organizations have significantly different placement philosophies which are not necessarily completely compatible.

4. The advent of the Job Bank has had little impact on community agency operations. Agencies utilize the system as a tool to be used as an alternative to their normal job development operations. In the interest of establishing better community relations, increasing credibility, and gaining wider Job Bank distribution in the community, the Employment Service would do well to include CA's in the Job Bank network. The possibility of outstationing regular Employment Service personnel in CA's should be investigated and considered in those Job Bank cities where Job Bank personnel is not outstationed in the community.

5. Job Bank also creates inefficiencies within the ES ranks as well. The WIN and CEP, like the CA's, primarily engage in

training or upgrading activities. Employment for employment's sake does not usually interest these programs except where employment can be related to training or upgrading activities. Job Bank cannot, by itself, serve this concern, since it does not offer any form of shelter to jobseekers who are at a competitive disadvantage. The Vets program gets such a shelter. Unless the Job Bank can make similar provisions for WIN, CEP, and CAA's, it will not be able to gain full use even within the ranks of the ES.

2.2 Employer Relations

Creators of new "things" frequently burden their creations by attributing unreasonable palliative powers to them. This is suggested and expressed by Job Bank goal two:

> ". . . to eliminate excessive and wasteful job solicitation visits to employers"

One way to ascertain Job Bank's ability to solve the problem is to ascertain the extent of its occurrence pre- and post-Job Bank. The statistical approach to this comparison was not possible since insufficient data was collected on the specific problem prior to the implementation of the Job Bank. As a result, indirect analyses had to be prepared. The problem, actually, is complex and breaks down into many smaller problems. This section will try to show Job Bank's effects on two implied problems: more duplicative attempts to develop job openings, and excessive levels of solicitation. A corollary problem relating to employer awareness of Job Bank services is also examined.

2.2.1 Duplicative Attempts to Develop Job Openings

The first question, "Have employers been subjected to fewer and less duplicative attempts to develop multiple openings?" arises from the increased number of public agencies engaged in a labor exchange operation. The increase obviously adds to the number of contacts an employer receives soliciting jobs. This was true in agencies that find themselves competing for the same jobs and from general undocumented complaints from employers regarding the number of solicitation attempts they are being subjected to. Job Bank's capability to reduce this competition and the volume of calls to an employer resides in JB's capacity to coordinate and control job development efforts. This capability has not been exploited to any great extent.

At the time of our interviews, formal job development or Employment Relations Representative (ERR) contacts had not been integrated into the Job Bank system. Some cities had reorganized their ERR units, but this was brought about as a result of staff reductions, program terminations, or despecialization of offices. Our data suggests that no substantive changes in ERR efforts resulted from the Job Bank implementation.

Relationships between the local ES offices and local community agencies, public and private, were found to be polite, reserved, but distant. The local ES offices exert no control over local community agency job development efforts, except in instances in which the community agency's form of participation in Job Bank is to provide office space to ES outstation personnel. In this case, the ES retains usual management control of its outstation but no effect on the agency beyond this form of control. The same statement made about ES-initiated job development can be made with respect to community agency job development. That is, the job development efforts of local community agencies had not been integrated into the Job Bank system, and, except for ES-operated outstations, coordination of effort is nonexistent. The local community agencies doing their own job development stated that the Job Bank had imposed only limited restraints on their operations and had, in fact, enhanced their job development capability by providing them with a large source document--the Job Bank Listing. Furthermore, these agencies still maintained their own separate employer files. Thus, it is possible to state that Job Bank has done little to reduce the job solicitation efforts of community agencies. Moreover, while there is an increase in solicitation, the community agencies have a different employer market.

2.2.2 Solicitation Levels

Employers' responses regarding solicitation levels were paradoxical. Employers in the sample were asked: "How frequently are you contacted in job development attempts?" This question was asked of both "users" (those employers who had used the Employment Service in the six-month period prior to our interview) and "non-users" (employers who had not used the ES in the six-month period prior to our interview). Of the 158 user-employers who responded, five said they were contacted "too frequently," 27 said they weren't contacted frequently enough, and 126 said they were contacted "about right." Thirty-three non-user employers responded to the same question. Twenty-seven non-user employers said they were contacted "about right."

Only three non-users said they were contacted "too much," and three said they weren't contacted enough. Interviews with ES staff and the difficulty we had in some cities getting to interview employers led us to expect quite different results.

When these employers were asked who contacted them, 134 user-employers reported being contacted by the ES, 20 by WIN, 21 by CEP, and 68 by other agencies, primarily private. The 33 non-user employers reported 24 were contacted by the ES, and one was contacted by NABS-JOBS. The interviewers also attempted to obtain data relative to the frequency with which each of these organizations contacted the employers. Since the employer keeps no records of such contacts, it was necessary to rely on the employer's memory for this data. The "guesstimate" figures we developed indicated that the employers interviewed were contacted on the average less than three times in any one month by any and all public service agencies. Correspondingly, private, for profit, employment agencies contacted employers with a significantly more--possibly averaging fourteen or more--contacts per month. The private, for profit, agencies harassed some employers so much that the employer told them to stop calling. No such complaint was registered against any of the public service manpower agencies (including the ES).

Neither of these groups of respondents indicated duplicative or excessive solicitation by the ES or associated agencies. How, then, can the complaints of excessive solicitaiton be explained? Two possibilities exist: first, employers may have been complaining about private agencies and, in the telling or listening, were misinterpreted as direct statements about the ES. The second explanation, which appears to be the most reasonable, is that complaints of excessive solicitation are not as pervasive as the discussion about them leads one to believe. In fact, we may have missed the employers subjected to such harassment completely.

How this could have happened can be seen through analysis of our sampling plan. The sampling of employers was random and stratified by company size and SIC. A minimum of eight employers with more than 50 employees was selected in each city. Very few of these large employers (and smaller employers) were well known locally and fewer nationally. It is possible that our sample plan simply missed most employers who were likely to be subject to extensive solicitation because of its objectivity. This theory is partially substantiated by our experience in one major city. This

city had been the subject of several studies prior to our visit. Employers were interviewed and the city management was afraid we would alienate their employers if they were subjected to a study team another time. The procedure agreed on was for us to select the sample and give the names to the office manager who would then compare our sample to the fifty or so employers interviewed in the prior studies. If a match was found, we agreed not to interview that employer.

The formal development effort in each city we visited is more selective than inclusive. That is, job developers preferred to visit employers they knew and from whom they had successfully obtained Job Orders. This group of preferred employers is only a small subset of the number of employers shown on the Job Order Listings. It is possible that community agencies in the area had discovered the same employers, thus resulting in complaints of over-solicitation.

We can only surmise that the complaints of excessive job solicitation are directed toward private agencies, or occur as a result of incomplete canvassing of all local employers by all labor-exchange organizations operating in the area.

2.2.3 Awareness of the System

Almost 60 percent of the user-employers interviewed remembered hearing about the Job Bank, and 52 percent of the non-user employers remembered what it was. Most of these employers had little idea as to what the Job Bank was designed to do beyond the fact that the Job Bank was computerized. It is likely that the reason so many employers remembered even this was because we gave away the answer when our interviewers asked, "Have you heard about the computerized Job Bank being used by the ES to provide better service to employers and applicants?"

2.2.4 Additional Findings

It is Ultrasystems' opinion that the formal ERR activity of the local ES office is extremely important to the success of the Job Bank concept. Without an adequate supply of good jobs to the Job Bank, Placement Interviewers will resort more and more to

individual job solicitations, and the ES cannot develop credibility as a good source of jobs in the community at large. We will not define what we mean by "adequate supply" or "good jobs," since such a discussion is beyond the scope of this report. However, we feel that the local ES offices are not developing an adequate supply of good jobs now.

Ultrasystems feels that part of the reason jobs submitted to the Job Bank are generally inadequate is that formal job development has been seriously neglected by the Employment Service. Individual job development by Placement Interviewers sitting at their desks, where permitted, is an immediate response to an individual with a particular problem, for whom the interviewer is trying to do a good job. Successful telephone developments result in jobs and referrals, but have nothing to do with the Job Bank system other than to make use of a built-in means of circumventing the system. Any other benefit, such as the individual job solicitation resulting in multiple job openings is simply a side product and cannot be relied upon.

Formal job development by ERR's, on the other hand, can serve more than just a single applicant and can lead to the development of multiple openings on a more reliable basis. ERR's can help further ES/JB objectives by directing their job development efforts to specific job types or categories which are directed toward general goals such as training-related jobs or job upgrading.

The foregoing discussion reads incredibly sophomoric or naive, but is written with full knowledge of the many fine and, by comparison, sophisticated pages on the subject in the ES manual. The discussion is meant to emphasize the sad state of formal job development in the local JB office. In Ultrasystems' opinion, formal ERR work has become "clubby," with ERR's working hard to perform tasks they have fogotten how to do, among the few employers they associate with.

Specifically, and as a result of interviewing, it was found that:

- None of the 15 Job Banks in the sample had integrated formal Job Development into the Job Bank system in any but superficial ways.

- Most cities had moved employer files or updated them or rearranged their filing order, but, although most of this work was a result of the Job Bank implementation, none of it was done with the aim of specifically using the results in Job Bank. The relevance of this work can be seen in the example of one city which changed the ERR's book of employers from a SIC assignment to Zip-coded geographic assignments when Job Bank was installed. That's all that happened.

- Only one city had developed a comprehensive plan for ERR canvassing of all employers or a target population of employers (such as all employers with five or more employees) in the city.

- ERR's in many cities had a quota of employers they had to visit, but the quotas, where they existed, related only to general objectives, not specific goals.

2.2.5 Conclusions

1. It is Ultrasystems' opinion that formal Job Development and Employer Relations is in a serious state of disrepair, and, though important to the usefulness and value of the Job Bank system in concept, is not fulfilling its obligation to the Job Bank concept.

2. Job Bank's goal of eliminating excessive and wasteful job solicitation visits to employers has not been seriously addressed in any of the sample cities.

3. Most employers do not consider ES-originated job solicitation levels excessive.

4. Job solicitation as it is currently being performed does not result in an excessive number of solicitation visits to most employers within any particular Job Bank's geographic area of responsibility.

2.3 Referral Control

The third major objective of Job Bank is to:

> ". . . eliminate excessive and wasteful referrals to employers."

This objective is intimately tied into the functioning of Job Bank Central, and is discussed in detail in Part III and other sections of this Part. Some answers with respect to this third goal can be summarized here.

Little progress has been made to eliminate excessive and wasteful referrals. This is the result of several problems or decisions, a few of which are:

- Job Orders, while technically complete with respect to required information, do not contain enough information to ensure correct matching of applicants to employers. For example, the order form makes no statements about an employer's personality, which makes it difficult for a person to work for him. This is information which a Placement Interviewer might know but not write down.

- Order Takers (and interviewers) do not have sufficient knowledge about employers or their jobs to ask and record necessary information. Thus, Order Takers can accept orders for machine operators without ever asking the name of the machine, not realizing that some operators can only operate certain machines.

- There is a time lapse between an order closing and verification. This often means that Referral Control will continue permitting referrals on closed orders.

- Office practice in many cities places no real limitations on the maximum number of referrals which can be made on any "open" order. Interviewers in some cities do not do an adequate job screening applicants (see Section 4.1, Impact on Employers), or do not screen at all.

- Most employers are not given the opportunity to set the level of referrals and do not know how many referrals to expect.

- In addition, Placement Interviewers and others are receiving and placing orders outside the Job Bank system, primarily because of constraints imposed by the Job Bank system.

The total effect of these and other problems mentioned elsewhere is that Job Bank has not eliminated excessive and wasteful referrals of workers to employers.

3.0 IMPACT ON SELECTED PROBLEMS

3.1 Employer Communications

One Job Bank state was attempting, on an experimental basis, to develop an employer file from the daily Job Bank runs. Several other Job Bank cities organized or reorganized their manual employer files after the advent of Job Bank. None of the Job Bank cities had integrated the Job Bank into their formal employer relations programs. Some Employment Relations Representatives stated that they did use the Job Bank List as a source of information for individual job development efforts, but no organized or rigorous job development program based on Job Bank information was in effect.

3.2 Decentralization

At first glance, it might seem that Job Bank would facilitate a movement toward decentralization of services. As implied in Section 2.1, Intra-Job Bank Coordination, it has not. Job Bank does mitigate some of the obstacles to decentralization but apparently not enough to warrant a new round of experimentation in decentralization. We were unable to determine the extent of decentralization just prior to the Job Bank installation, but it was, we surmise, no more extensive than it was at the time of our survey.

Methods of disseminating ES placement services throughout the community have been through such options as outstationing ES personnel in storefront locations and offices of various community groups such as Model Cities and Community Action Agencies (CAA's). Other methods, such as mobile vans and traveling Placement Interviewers, are also being used on a very limited basis. A major obstacle to such activities has been in finding an effective means of supplying such activities with current lists of job openings.

Methods used to supply these outstations with job openings have consisted of everything from supplying outstation personnel with copies of Job Order openings to requiring outstation staff to do their own job development. The Job Bank system has mitigated this problem somewhat. Through the use of film, fiche, or book, outstation or mobile personnel can now, and do, possess the same full listing of job openings as the central office staff.

However, listings of job openings are not the only problem that must be solved if Job Bank is to have significant effect on the decision to decentralize office services. There are cost implications associated with the decentralization of Job Bank services.

Most of the States are caught in a budget squeeze, and Job Bank has not produced any obvious operating economies, either in cost or manpower, to ease this squeeze. Job Bank has not reduced the outstationed team's need to perform their own job development activities. Job Bank only serves a portion of the outstation's needs--it does not facilitate testing or extensive counseling. The outstation usually serves a target population and thus may be in the same situation as the CAA's with respect to Job Bank utility.

Job Bank, in fact, creates additional problems which tend to operate against some of decentralization's advantages. Mobile vans and roving teams covering rural areas must be able to get access to telephones in order to obtain referral clearances. If they operate in remote areas, it is difficult to get current books. A pickup point must be established, and the team must be able to get there each day to pick up the current book. Delivery of the book is performed in two ways in Job Banks with remote offices or outstations. One is by use of the U.S. mail, and the other by messenger-serviced "drops." Both techniques required a fixed pickup point and reliable delivery service. Mail service, of course, is not under ES control, and the new lists could not be used until the mail was actually received several hours after the office was opened for the day.

None of the Job Banks surveyed had created an outstation or mobility team because of Job Bank. The outstations or mobility teams that were discovered were in existence prior to the installation of the Job Bank system.

Another problem can arise if the office or outstation wishes to provide service after normal working hours. None of the cities interviewed indicated that they had attempted to extend normal working hours, but, if they did, it would come in conflict with Referral Control. Either Referral Control would have to extend its hours to accommodate the open outstation, or the control book would have to be delivered to the open outstation so they could control their own referrals. A final undesirable technique would be to abandon control of extended hours offices.

Synchronizing the office with extended hours to the Job Bank update places additional burdens on processing staff and creates the same problems mentioned above.

Regardless of the technical problems already mentioned, we think applicants will more than likely be interviewed by employers during normal working hours. A way must be found to inform the employer

that an applicant is coming during normal working hours, or the employers' complaints about non-notification will increase. (See Section 4.1.2, Number of Referrals.) A way must also be found to stop the applicant from going on the referral if the job is closed. Staff complaints about the slowness of verification procedures indicate that pre-calling employers to verify that the order is still open is highly desirable.

Ultrasystems does not believe that Job Bank solves enough of the problems of decentralization to permit the decentralization decision to be made solely on technical grounds. Job Bank may, in effect, have increased these problems. There is insufficient experimentation occurring at the local level to enable positive statements to be made regarding enhanced decentralization capability.

Ultimately, Job Bank does little to force or require decentralization. The decision to decentralize operations is still a management decision, and this decision has not been made in any Job Bank visited, to the extent that moving vans could be utilized or to provide services during extended hours.

4.0 IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

4.1 Employers

4.1.1 Awareness of the Job Bank

We had two methods of determining whether or not employers were aware of the Job Bank system. The first method was to ask the ES staff--job developers in particular--if employers had ever heard of the Job Bank. The second method was to ask the employers themselves. The ES staff agreed almost unanimously that employers did know of the Job Bank. Office managers told us of mailings and media spots used to introduce Job Bank to local employers. Job developers, while not so certain that all area employers knew about Job Bank, were certain that all employers they visited were aware of the Job Bank, since the job developers made special efforts to inform their employers of the Job Bank.

We next asked the employers if they had "heard about the computerized Job Bank being used by the ES to provide better service to employers and applicants." Two hundred twenty-five user employers (those who had used the ES in the six months prior to the interviews) responded to the question. Fully 40 percent (91) answered that they had not heard of the Job Bank before. Of the 63 non-user employers (those who had not used the Job Bank in the previous six-month period) 47 percent (30) answered similarly.

Why do such discrepancies exist between statements by the ES and employers? One possible reason is that the term "Job Bank" has no meaning for employers. Most employers interviewed have no idea as to how the ES operates and many don't care. To employers, the only picture they get of the Employment Service is in the results they obtain from their efforts to use the ES. Even so, the Job Bank has an image it can project, and if public relations ideas can be accepted, the "image" can be communicated in several ways. One way would be through significantly improved service, and another way would be through a relevant public relations campaign which had an impact on the employer market. As shown throughout this report, service has not significantly improved as a result of Job Bank. This leaves the public relations approach as a means for improving or disseminating the new image.

After asking employers whether or not they had heard of Job Bank, we asked them how they heard of Job Bank. Twenty-eight percent (48) of the users and non-users said they learned of Job Bank through ERR visits and 21 percent (35) said they learned of Job Bank over the phone. This presumably happened when they tried

to place an order, since none of the non-users indicated learning of the Job Bank in this manner. Job Bank was announced by mail in several cities, but this was one shot and only 16 percent of all employers remembered hearing about Job Bank this way. The remaining employers indicated they learned of Job Bank through the media or "other means." Other means could have been any one of the previously mentioned methods, TV, radio, newspapers, or referred applicants. One employer learned of Job Bank from the Wall Street Journal, which was not a medium intentionally used by the local ES.

We returned to the ES in an effort to resolve the discrepancies. Job developers pulled out their "sales" kits and assured the interviewers that they do tell their empllyers of Job Bank. The managers shows us news clippings and told of TV and radio announcements. Placement Interviewers informed us of the rush of applicants after Job Bank was announced on TV. One manager told us rather regretfully of a local paper offering space in the Sunday supplement for a Job Bank story. The manager didn't have an acceptable "story" and no article was published.

4.1.2 Creation or Alleviation of Employer Complaints

User employers in fifteen cities were asked if they could tell the difference in quality of service since the Job Bank was installed. One hundred eighty-five user-employers responded to the questions on quality and quantity of referrals and procedure. Only 67 (36%) noticed any change at all in the Employment Service. The following table shows the responses given.

	Better	Same	Worse	Total Responses
Quality of Referrals	27	57	16	100
Number of Referrals	31	52	11	94
Verif. Procedures	25	57	8	89
Order Taking	23	58	8	88
Job Development	13	54	6	73
General Relationship	22	53	12	87

Employers did not answer, or had no opinions, about some of the questions asked, and so the total number of responses to individual categories is not uniform. The better or worse categories were tested, using a 90 percent binomial confidence limit, and all categories of improvements except job development were found to be significant. The job development category had too small a sample to

test. These are cumulative totals, however, and individual city analysis revealed that there were never more than four employers in any one city citing improvement for any specific category. Furthermore, almost 64 percent, or 118 of 185, of responding employers said they noticed no change in the Employment Service since Job Bank installation. It is imperative, then, to analyze the "same" categories to determine if employers' definitions of "same" are actually services that Job Bank should have impacted upon but didn't. In general, this analysis resulted in equating the "same" with the "worse" categories, since many employers' interview responses implicitly or explicitly indicated that they were not happy with the ES in the past and no change had occurred.

Quality of Referrals: Most statements of satisfaction with ES referrals came from employers seeking to fill low-wage, low-skilled positions. These employers didn't expect much and were generally less particular in establishing demanding job requirements. There were, however, occasional complaints as when overqualified workers were sent on low-skill jobs, or where low-skilled applicants were referred to low-skill jobs and lived an unreasonable (to the employer) distance from the job.

When job requirements or restrictions became more demanding, the employers generally complained of the screening procedure or excused the Employment Service with statements such as ". . . with the economy the way it is, I guess they're doing the best they can. . . ," which we interpreted as a polite complaint about screening. Eighty-seven of 213 employers answered "no" to the question: "Did the people referred to your office by the Employment Service have the education, work skills and other qualifications that you requested?" The most frequent explanation for the "no" answers was that the local ES didn't understand the job requirements.

A ladies' ready-to-wear store, needing a cashier, refused to hire an individual with drugstore cashier's experience because she felt the jobs were too different. Small firms requesting all-around clerical help were sent individuals with specific types of experience and no desire to perform varied work, and other firms were sent clerical referrals who had no clerical experience or training. One employer reported being sent individuals who could not speak or understand English.

"Bias" was admitted to as well. Several employers said they didn't like or want "so many blacks." One firm complained that the ES referrals made it hard for them to "maintain a

racial balance." In another form of bias, a few firms refused to hire anyone sent by an agency unless desperate. It was their attitude that anyone who needed someone else's help in finding jobs couldn't be very good. This attitude was found in employers whose need was in skilled occupational groups such as carpentry or linesmen. (Paradoxically, the employer of linesmen thought the idea of a statewide clearance system for linesmen would be a great idea and very useful to him.) Impartial screening in these cases was a losing battle, almost by definition.

Number of Referrals: Few employers complained of receiving an excessive number of referrals. Employers did complain in every city that they were not able to rely on the local ES for referrals, partially because referrals were unqualified, but mainly because it took several days before anyone referred by the ES arrived; that not enough individuals were referred; that no warning was given employers that referrees were coming for interviews, and that they had no idea that anyone was to be referred at all. These prevalent complaints can be attributed to the fact that in no city did the employers say they were told how many referrals to expect, nor did any JBC have this policy. With respect to this latter point, most employers stated that they did not rely solely on the ES to fill their jobs. They placed ads or used private agencies simultaneously. The uncertainty as to whether or not anyone was being referred left some employers with the feeling that their orders were lost. (We checked out three such complaints and discovered that the orders on two were lost.)

Verification Procedures: Most employers had no problems with the verification procedures. A few were mystified by the number of verification calls as opposed to the number of applicants that arrived. Some never bothered with verification cards or completed them the same way regardless of the outcome of the interview. About half of the employers attempted to complete the verification cards accurately but from memory. A very few employers referred to their interview records to complete the verification cards, and only one of these employers thought it was "a lot of work" to complete the cards. One employer surprised our interviewer with the statement that he always called the local office each time he hired anyone, regardless of who referred the person. This friendly bit of cooperation enabled an interviewer to claim credit for all persons hired by this employer.

Order Taking: The Order Taker became in most cities the only contact the employer had with the ES. Several employers complained that the Order Taker was rude, insolent, or tactless to them. One employer said that when he told an Order Taker the salary he paid, the Order Taker responded with "Is that all?" and hung up on him before he could complete his order. This order could not be found in the Job Bank listing, even though the employer said he called twice to determine its status.

A prevalent complaint (paraphrased) was that "the Order Taker asked enough questions but still didn't let them describe everything they wanted to describe." Thus, employers were faced with Order Takers accepting the employer's job title as comparable with the DOT-described titles, when no comparability existed. One city interpreted the rules against age discrimination so strictly that a restaurant and a firm performing household surveys stopped using the ES. Order Takers in this city told the employers that they could not restrict the job requirements to individuals eighteen years of age or older. The firms felt that there was legitimate reason to place this minimum requirement; they were not given a review for purposes of obtaining a waiver from the rule, and so refused to accept sixteen-year-olds sent by the ES, and withdrew their orders.

Job Development: As mentioned in a prior section, employers had no complaints about job development. Comments were mostly complimentary to the job developer. The most serious statement made about job development was that the ES was not aggressive enough.

General Relationship: In general, although there were some dropouts among employers classified as users, there does not appear to be any change in ES/employer relationships. A few employers (not statistically significant) stated that they would prefer working with the same Placement Interviewer each time. This desire appears to be a reaction to some of the problems mentioned above, since none of the interviewed employers said they would stop using the Employment Service because of the change to Job Bank. Interviewers told us some employers refused to use Job Bank, but those employers did not appear in our sample.

4.1.3 Reactions to Job Bank

Employers generally liked the idea of the Job Bank and saw possibilities in some features of the Job Bank as described to them by the interviewers. This reaction was largely of a hypothetical nature, since few employers could see differences in the quality of service offered them. Exceptions occurred in smaller cities where, historically, long-term relationships were maintained. In some instances, employers requested that their jobs not be put in the Job Bank because they wanted the local office or a particular PI to handle the jobs. These requests were honored by the local office. The only other change noticed by employers was a single telephone number with which to call the ES and the substitution of the Order Taker for the Placement Interviewer.

4.1.4 Requests for Service

Most employers wanted better screening of applicants prior to referrals. Employers also requested that orders be confirmed and that they be provided with status reports on the progress of their orders. Employers in three cities wanted to know what services the ES provided so they could make better use of the ES and Job Bank.

In two cities, employers suggested that the ES expand their services to include skilled and professional occupations. There were a number of requests for the ES to provide training--of the disadvantaged--of clerical applicants in office skills. One employer, in fact, suggested that the ES could do testing of applicants.

4.2 Impact on Community Agencies

4.2.1 Community Agency Acceptance of Job Bank

The passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided diversity and experimentation in an area of activity that was heretofore the private domain of the federally affiliated State Employment Services. Over two thousand Community Action Agencies were given birth to provide a wide range of activities and services in an effort to eradicate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty.

During the course of this study, fifty-six community agencies were contacted. Because of the scope of their activity, the agencies selected were those that had some relationship to manpower

programs and the disadvantaged. As such, they would be natural participants in their cities' Job Bank systems, but the extent of community agency participation must be viewed in proper perspective.

Since their development, community agencies and the Employment Service have not seen eye to eye on a number of issues. Each has guarded its jurisdictional responsibilities jealously and, although outright abrasive confrontation has ceased, manifestations of the deep-seated distrust surfaces sometimes when they work together. The Job Bank system illustrates the point well.

Of the fifteen Job Bank cities visited, four had no community agency participation. Community agencies in four cities were not participants in their city's Job Bank network. According to the CA's, by the time the applicant was served, the job was either filled or the referral limit had been reached. On the other hand, community agencies in the other eleven Job Bank cities were participating partners with the Employment Service. Although none had participated in the planning phase of the Job Bank, community agency personnel were trained in the mechanics, referral procedures, and documentation requirements of the system. In a number of cities, Employment Service personnel were outstationed at the community agency permanently, so that there was no need to formally train additional personnel.

But to what degree was there real participation and utilization of the compendium of job information? The answer is both simple and complex, for while community agencies appear to have a parallel program to that of the Employment Service, in fact, it is not. Community agencies visited did not engage in the business of placing applicants on a regular basis, that is, unless and Employment Service Placement Interviewer was outstationed at the agency. They served disadvantaged applicants by providing training or by developing jobs for them principally with the major employers in the city. When a client is referred, there is a high probability that the employer will hire him. As an Urban League Job Developer said, "We want to make 99% sure that our client will be hired before he is referred. It is ridiculous to make thirty-one referrals for three openings."

Other community agencies such as the Skills Centers, Vocational Rehabilitation and the Occupation Industrialization Centers are similarly involved in the business of training and placing their graduates. According to them, the Job Bank has not affected their operation in the slightest.

More than 80 percent of the community agencies, including the non-user agencies, said that the Employment Service has very poor, low-paying, menial jobs. They said many of the jobs listed are already filled and the Job Orders are inaccurate. Community agencies in one city, for example, said that "75 percent of [the] time [Job Orders are] inaccurate as to Job Order status." In another city, an agency said, ". . . the Job Bank Book [is] not relevant to minorities; a lot of people leave thinking they're getting something, but in reality they are not. The Job Bank is middle-class oriented, not for uneducated, illiterate minority."

The first and last sentences of the preceding paragraph seem to contradict each other, but they do not. The first sentence reflects what community agencies believe to be the quality of services provided them or their constituents. The last sentence reflects what community agencies believe to be the attitudes of the Job Bank (or ES), which is "middle-class," and therefore unable to begin to understand their concerns or to take appropriate actions based on these concerns. Poor quality of service (e.g., referral to a ". . . poor, low-paying menial job. . .") is considered, in this case, to be a result of middle-class attitudes, such as those which consider welfare recipients all to be "lazy loafers, content to live off the dole," and, therefore, good only for menial, low-paying jobs. The attitude and result operate irrespective of the particular individual's reason for being on welfare, his attitude toward work, or his as yet undemonstrated capabilities.

Another way in which attitudes differ is in operating philosophy of community agencies surveyed, which was different from that of the Employment Service, and might explain CA reaction. With respect to similar functions regarding placements, one is totally applicant-oriented, the other is not. As one agency puts it, ". . . minorities don't have as much experience due to lack of opportunities." Developing job opportunities seems to be the universal theme within community agency ranks. Similarly, these reasons were given for not inputing their Job Orders into the Job Bank and for not sharing their employer lists with Employment Relations Representatives.

4.2.2 Perception of the Job Bank

There was unanimity among CA's regarding the need for better communication and cooperation. Like recurring threads in an intricate tapestry, almost all the community agencies want more trust and cooperation; further, that minorities be referred to other than menial, dead-end jobs; that more minorities be hired by the ES, and that the Employment Service assume the role of an agent for change.

With respect to Job Bank-created problems, the majority of complaints made by CA's were precisely the same as those cited by Employment Service staff. The specific items include:

- Increased paper work
- Poor verification procedures
- Process too time consuming

4.2.3 Community Agency Suggestions

Among other specific recommendations made by CA's are the following:

- Extend or provide services during evening. With the Job Bank many under-employed can avail themselves of the service without having to unnecessarily leave their present jobs.

- Index Job Orders by geographic area. Many disadvantaged do not have means of transportation and this would be helpful.

- ES should increase their job solicitation and development efforts. They are not doing enough in this area.

- Speed up the verification procedures.

- Hire more minorities. "The ES staff has been on that white horse so long that they think no one else can ride. It's because of us poor that they have jobs but they have long forgotten that," said a community agent respondent from a small southern city.

- Change Employment Service staff attitudes about their clients.

- Increase outstationing of personnel into inner-city and poverty areas.

4.3 Impact on ES and Staff

This section concerns itself with the initiative involved in changing from one system to another and with the ability of the staff to take advantage of those changes once the inertia has been broken. Management, staff members, Placement Interviewers, counselors, Job

Developers, and intake clerks were interviewed in an effort to get some insight into these problems with respect to Job Bank. Unfortunately, the answer was not always clearcut, since other changes were occurring in the local offices due to ESARS, and, in some cases, COMO or COMO-type implementations. Our interviewers and, indeed, the interviewees themselves, were not always able to distinguish between the sources of change.

4.3.1 Personnel Problems

Personnel can express their objection to the Job Bank system covertly or overtly. Covert reactions could take the form of absolute adherence to written rules regardless of the situation at hand, or disloyalty as expressed by actions such as making derogatory statements about the system to anyone (especially evaluators) who will listen. This type of problem is discussed in Section 4.3.4, Adjustment to Job Bank, below. Overt reactions would take the form of strikes, protest meetings, or simple and verbally expressed refusal to perform job functions as required by the new system, or deliberately referring the wrong people to the wrong jobs. Personnel problems as used in this section also refer to simple mistakes in estimating personnel needs and requirements.

Job Bank created the need for placing personnel into positions which heretofore did not exist within the local ES office. It was initially thought, by some ES managers interviewed, that personnel shifts into these new positions could be effected with little or no additional personnel as the result of Job Bank-related savings in other areas. This idea was promoted in some cases by budgetary considerations which prevented some cities from increasing personnel budgets significantly, and in a few instances required an overall reduction in personnel.

Job Bank introduced one new function to local operations--Referral Control; modified others--Order Taking, Verification; and indirectly added a third--reconciling JBOR data with ESARS data. Each function required the assignment or reassignment of personnel to perform these functions. Other than statements as to the tedious nature of the Central Control functions, none of the Central Control personnel interviewed displayed intransigence or refused to accept the Job Bank system.

In one city, personnel were rotated in the Central Control functions; another city seemed to assign all its "deadwood" there. Only one city was found to have personnel difficulties, and this occurred from an attempt to use WIN work experience enrollees in the Central Control Unit. Most other staff members interviewed

knew how to perform their functions where they were affected by the Job Bank system, but had little or no idea as to how their performance affected other functions in the Job Bank system. Still, there was a general acceptance of Job Bank by staff members.

Very few personnel expressed a strong desire to return to the pre-Job Bank system. Staff complaints were found to relate to specific problems in the system itself. For example, the strongest objections were expressed by Placement Interviewers who objected to losing their close relations with employers. However, we found no personnel problems caused by shifted responsibilities as a result of Job Bank.

4.3.2 Staff Perception of the Job Bank

The reaction of local office staff in most cities might be described as somewhat schizophrenic. On the one hand, generally favorable comments were made about the Job Bank concept and, at the same time, expressed vehement criticism to specific procedures. Staff comments seemed to fall into four general groups:

Procedural

Many staff members felt that they could discharge their responsibilities better during pre-Job Bank days because they could control the process. They said Job Bank required too much paper shuffling and that there was a diminution of quality and quantity of service. On the other hand, in self-service cities, PI's praised the JB because it reduced paperwork!

Perfunctory Acceptance

Some of the long-time Placement Interviewers saw Job Bank as an experiment which would soon come to an end. Some even expressed the hope that this study would contribute to its early demise.

Job Bank Book as a Training Tool

The Job Bank Book, in itself, possesses great training possibilities. One counselor said that she had a better idea now of what jobs were available in the area. Many Placement Interviewers thought that the JB was excellent for new PI's who didn't know the area or the employers. Some experienced interviewers even commented that the list helped them in performing placement or job development in occupations or sections of the city that they were unfamiliar with before.

Other Complaints

Increased paperwork due to Job Bank and other system-imposed requirements.

Investigation revealed that in most instances the complaints revolved about the Job Bank ESARS forms. When asked to show specifically how the paperwork had increased, most interviewers brought out ESARS forms to demonstrate. When pressed for Job Bank specific complaints, the interviewers would point out the similarity between the Job Bank statistical forms, ESARS, and 511's.

Office managers spoke of the difficulties in reconciling ESARS information with Job Bank information and of the need to retain in-office report forms to use in reconciliations.

Individual job developments create still more paperwork. Technically, when such a development is made, the Placement Interviewer must fill out a Job Order and a stat card. If it takes more than one day to determine if the applicant got the job, the interviewer will likely hold onto the order until he can complete the results section of the stat card. This means that the interviewer will have to store the Job Order and stat card until he can submit it. It also means that the interviewer will have to fill out a Job Order on an Individual Job Development where he may not have in the past. Or, if the Job Order was completed in the past, it will have to be completed in more detail.

The detail required by Job Bank forms gives rise to still other complaints. One interviewer strongly objected to "Mickey Mouse" attention to detail. Although no more information is required on Job Bank forms than in the manual system forms, the Job Bank forms must be completed now. This gives rise to complaints about the increased amount of time required to fill them out.

Objections are also expressed as to the amount of time spent in obtaining permission from Referral Control to fill an order and, in the cities where it si permitted, to calling the employer to determine if the job is still available.

As discussed more thoroughly in Part III, verification is not being performed as quickly or as accurately as needed by the line interviewer. This means the interviewer will call the employer before each referral if this practice is permitted to determine if the order is still open. In these offices, such calls will be made by applicant-oriented interviewers irrespective of whether the job listing shows a "call first" flag.

4.3.3 Training

Training for Job Bank has been universally short. All the Job Banks evaluated had formal class sessions of two to three days during which the Job Bank was implemented in their offices. Method ranged from reading the Job Bank Manual to the staff to the full use of audiovisual techniques including TV. All the training emphasized the mechanical tasks which had to be performed (forms completion, employer contact rules, etc.), and none provided any in-depth information to the staff with respect to the ultimate objectives of Job Bank or to Job Bank's relationship to other planned improvements in the system.

No attempt was made to assist the Placement Interviewers to reinterpret their functions with respect to Job Bank.

None of the employees interviewed who had been hired after the Job Bank was implemented received formal Job Bank training. Ongoing training, if given, consisted of OJT for all employees.

The majority of local staff interviewed stated that the training was "good" or "useful," but few remembered who gave it or what it consisted of. Few staff members cared to offer recommendations regarding the training, and those who did gave conflicting responses. For example, interviewing staff in the same city would praise and condemn the content of the training. Two comments did emerge which were not neutralized by conflicting statements. One was that Order Takers needed more training and that staff in offices which do not have the Central Contol Unit would like to observe Central Control in order to better understand Central Control's problems. The comment regarding the Order Takers apparently referred to information gaps in the Job Orders shown on the Job Bank Listing. No training in computer technology was provided to the staff.

4.3.4 Adjustment to Job Bank

The staff has adjusted rather rapidly to Job Bank in some ways and not at all in others. Clerical tasks and procedures, for example, are well in hand. Problems resulting from inflexibilities in the system are adapted to wherever possible. However, interviewing staff are having great difficulty in adjusting to the removal of close ties with employers. Some cities have instituted

blanket prohibitions against contacting employers, and some interviewers in cities with no such prohibitions have interpreted less restrictive rules as total prohibitions.

Interviewers who were doing interviewing in the pre-Job Bank days have, except in one instance, forgotten their previous complaints about having to stop in the middle of interviews to take Job Orders. These complaints have been replaced by complaints about the quality of the job descriptions shown in the Job Bank Listing. Hence, the suggestions mentioned above that the Order Takers need more training because they are not collecting enough information about the jobs or the employers. Comparison of pre- and post-Job Bank Order forms shows that the order information forms require about the same amount of information. Job developers have stated that the job information being collected now is being posted to the order forms in more detail than in the past. Furthermore, in some Job Banks, interviewers take turns order taking. Despite all of this, interviewers still complain heavily about order information.

Detailed questioning of interviewers and analysis of the order forms revealed that the order forms had what Ultrasystems considers to be a major deficiency. Nowhere on the Job Lists we looked at was there any mention of subjective employer "preferences" of the sort which interviewers take into consideration but seldom write down. The preferences can range from obvious and illegal bias against black minorities to the more exotic woman chaser who frightens off every young and pretty applicant. The interviewer could often find out about these preferences from explicit statements by employers, interpreting these things from the employer's statements or by analyzing the results of referrals over a period of time.

Under Job Bank, the interviewer has lost the close and continuous contact with the employer necessary to help him determine preferences. Verification, by placing referral results into nine or ten officially acceptable categories loses this information. The Order Taker tends to filter out this information as well, and Referral Control does even more screening. It is possible that eventually a coding system will be developed which will communicate this employer-expressed preference through the Job Order Listing to interviewers "in the know," but the referral analysis information will be lost. Ultrasystems believes that the loss of this subjective information is the major and possibly the only reason for interviewer complaints about Order Taking.

The reaction of the interviewer to this has been either to turn the referral process into a mechanical operation of matching written applicant qualifications to the Job Order or to bypass the system by several methods, including an unnecessarily large number of "job development" contacts with employers or arrangements with employers to keep their order out of the system until an actual referral is made.

4.3.5 Staff Suggestions for Improvements

The complexity of the Job Bank system and an apparently limited knowledge of its workings or objectives may have constrained many individuals from making suggestions for improvements. We received very few specific suggestions for improving the operation of the system. These suggestions concerned indexing the Job Order Listings by geographic area and age of order to facilitate the search. In one city, the manager told us he considered such requests for fear that interviewers would get lazy and not search the rest of the file if no job possibilities could be found in a selected index

4.3.6 Other Staff Uses of Job Bank

The staff does not perceive the use of Job Bank data as helpful to them in their work. They only receive job listings and referral transaction reports. They do not receive Job Bank-derived reports such as those concerned with job trends, employer analysis, wage scales, geographic trends, or applicant/employer referral analyses.

Only one intervieweee, a counselor, personally experienced any benefits. The benefit was derived from the Job List. She said the list gave her a better idea of the local labor market.

4.4 Applicants

The employment process begins with the availability of jobs and concludes when workers are found to meet the employers' job requirements. The process is generally facilitated by any number of intermediators. Thus far, the preceding discussions have centered around these intermediators or providers of service, as well as employers. This subsection will discuss the reaction and impact that the Job Bank-directed job-search efforts have had on the applicant, if any.

In order to obtain applicant-related information, on-site interviews were conducted in each of the 15 Job Bank cities. In all, over 800 interviews were completed, under different circumstances, and from various types of applicants. At least 50 interviews were done in each city, of which 25 were Job Bank applicants selected at random intervals as they were leaving the local Employment Service/Job Bank office. This type of JB client is termed Walkout applicant in the balance of this report.

The other type of applicant-interview was conducted at the applicant's place of residence. To select these, a random sample of the active Job Bank applicant files was drawn, and, again, 25 were interviewed. Hereafter, this group will be referred to as the at-home applicants. For a thorough discussion on the sample, see Appendix A, "Methodology," of this report.

4.4.1 Quality of Service

Service to the applicant within the 15-city Job Banks varied depending on a number of local and national factors. From the applicant's point of view, being placed on the job is the important thing. If, after waiting a certain length of time, due to the volume of applicant traffic, he is referred to a job and gets it, then the wait was worth it. On the other hand, if the applicant is not referred and therefore obviously will not get a job through the ES/JB, then the time lost waiting was wasted and thus the service is considered worthless.

Nearly 70 percent of the responding applicants in the study sample indicated that they had waited 45 minutes or less, as is shown in the tabulation on the following page. Surprisingly, there was no significant difference between the walkout and the at-home applicant responses to the question.

Applicant reaction to the usefulness of the service provided them was very closely related between the two groups. Moreover, the applicant responses were fairly evenly distributed, as will be seen from the tabulation on page 2-36.

Of the walkout applicant sample, nearly 40 percent responded that they were being referred to a job. A comparison with the at-home applicant is not made because everyone in the sample had been referred and/or placed.

How long did you have to wait to see a person about possibly referring you to an employer?

Time	Number of Respondents	Percent
Less than 15 minutes	307	43
15-30 minutes	118	16
30-45 minutes	66	9
More than 45 minutes	217	30
Total respondents to question	708	

Did you feel that the service you received helped you?

Response	Number of Respondents	Percent
Lots of help, got referred	257	34
Some help, but not what I wanted	237	33
Little or no help, not useful	255	34
Total respondents	749	

Where self-service was provided, an option available to JB's which permits the applicant to peruse the JBB to select a job or jobs, nearly 94 percent of a limited sample of respondents availed themselves to this special feature. Again, this limited sample of 58 respondents liked this new feature as it reduced waiting time. Nearly 81 percent said that they did not have to wait more than two minutes. With respect to the usability of the Job Bank Book, nearly 90 percent indicated that the overall ease of usage was good

or adequate. Only 10 percent said that overall ease of usage was poor. It is interesting to mention that some of the at-home applicants responded that while they were currently working, periodically they would go to the ES during their lunch hour to review the JBB.

But being referred is entirely different from getting a job. Many of the at-home applicants expressed the view that the Placement Interviewer referred them to jobs that no longer existed or that too many other applicants had been sent to apply for the job. Indeed, many PI's indicated that their clients did not understand the referral process. Too many of them, particularly in the larger cities in the sample, said that "these people think they are going to get the job we refer them to."

Analysis of the Job Bank Operations Review (JBOR) data indicates that applicants may be right. According to these data, which are JB-city produced, a large percentage of the Job Bank Book jobs are filled the same day. For instance, 60 percent of all Job Orders are filled the same day in one midwestern city; 46 percent in another and 42 percent in two southern cities; in two other large metropolitan cities, 33 percent and 43 percent, respectively, or more than a third of their Job Orders are filled the same day. Recognizing the length of time that it takes to obtain verification on the status of the referrals, the applicants are correct in their assessment.

4.4.2 Analysis of Applicant Sample

The current economic conditions are such that there are insufficient jobs for the number of workers available. Further, while the labor force has steadily risen, the number of new workers joining the non-institutional work force has also risen. Analysis of the questionnaire data indicates that nearly 30 percent (of 658 respondents) had never been to the Employment Service/Job Bank before.

Further analysis shows that the mean age of 793 respondents using the Job Bank was 28.3 years. The mean educational attainment was 11.2 years of schooling (316 respondents). Finally, of 500 respondents, nearly 60 percent were not looking for any particular job--just a job.

The information presented above, while non-Job Bank related, suggests that during the time of the field data collection, the population availing itself of the services provided by the Employment Service was very young, sufficiently well educated, and in critical need of employment.

4.4.3 Awareness of Job Bank

More than 50 percent of the applicant sample had not noticed any changes in the Employment Service lately. In fact, a large percentage of the total applicant sample of 815 didn't even know what the Job Bank was; that is, except for those applicants in self-service cities. When the question was posed regarding the JB or the Open Order List, the applicants would respond, "What's that?" They had to be provided with additional clues to which they would respond, "Oh, the TV set on the desk. Yes (in 20% of the cases, out of 721 respondents, No), the interviewer looked at it before giving me this job (or before telling me that there were no jobs)." With this information, many walkout applicants would ask, "If, as you say, there are many jobs in the Job Bank, how come there isn't one for me?"

4.4.4 Conclusions

Community agencies have been saying that the jobs listed with the ES/JB are dead end, menial, and low-paying. Many of the applicants interviewed said the same thing. However, they were using the ES out of desperation. Analysis of Job Bank city produced JBOR data supports their contention.

Using JBOR data from the most current month and going back for at least twelve months (when data was available), it was found that nearly two-thirds of all the placements made during the period paid less than $2.20 per hour. Geographic location was not necessarily important, for in one large metropolitan city, 73.2% of the placements yielded less than $2.20 an hour. See Table 2-2.

Review of JBOR data for the same period revealed that nearly one-third of the orders received were in the Clerical and Sales Occupations; approximately 22%, across the board, were in the Service Occupations. See Table 2-3.

Except where self-service is provided, the majority of the applicants do not know much about the Job Bank network. The ES, and most particulary its agents, have not communicated with or informed their clients.

Whatever ill-will the Employment Service may have acquired over the years, the Job Bank can be used to foster better relations with its clients. For the first time, even if the applicant does not get a job, the ES/JB can provide information, rather than simply take it from its applicant.

TABLE 2-2

12 MONTH* PLACEMENTS BY WAGE RATE

FOR 15 JOB BANK CITIES - JBOR TABLE IV

(Percentages are cumulative of total)

JB City	Total Placements	Under 1.30		1.30-1.60		1.61-2.19		2.20-2.79		2.80-3.39		3.40+ **	
			%		%		%		%		%		%
No. 1*	1901	306	16.1	443	39.4	609	71.4	161	79.9	82	84.2	300	100
No. 2	14647	2047	13.9	5255	49.8	5650	88.4	893	94.5	335	96.8	467	100
No. 3	6826	330	4.8	961	18.9	3367	68.2	1141	85.1	484	92.1	533	100
No. 4	32049	655	2.0	1532	6.8	9907	37.7	9315	66.8	4688	81.4	5952	100
No. 5	6758	202	2.9	1051	18.5	2449	54.7	1346	74.6	1319	94.2	391	100
No. 6*	4993	312	6.2	1259	31.4	1882	69.1	515	79.4	411	87.7	614	100
No. 7	23378	405	1.7	7610	34.3	5880	59.4	4332	77.9	2240	87.5	2911	100
No. 8	4255	149	3.5	828	22.9	1801	65.2	822	84.6	349	92.8	306	100
No. 9*	6478	71	1.1	272	5.3	3144	53.8	1961	84.1	693	94.8	337	100
No. 10	6444	41	.6	57	1.5	3276	52.4	1260	71.9	815	84.6	995	100
No. 11	5260	572	10.9	857	27.2	2825	81.9	511	90.6	105	92.6	390	100
No. 12	4113	94	2.3	687	19.0	1506	55.6	1018	80.3	273	86.9	535	100
No. 13	14743	794	5.4	3635	30.0	4214	58.6	4903	91.9	516	95.4	681	100
No. 14	11865	2566	21.6	1126	31.1	5005	73.2	2097	90.9	602	96.0	469	100
No. 15*	9036	124	1.4	1166	14.3	4784	67.2	1832	87.5	391	91.8	739	100

NOTES: *Data from most recent month (either Nov, Oct, Sep or Aug 1971) to 12th month.

8 month data for City No. 1.
7 month data for City No. 6.
11 month data for City No. 9.
11 month data for City No. 15.

**And not paid on time basis.

TABLE 2.3

15 JOB BANK CITY SUMMARY OF JOB ORDERS RECEIVED

BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND PERCENT OF TOTAL ORDERS RECEIVED - JBOR TABLE II

JB City	Prof., Tech. & Managerial Occup.	Percentage of Total Orders Received	Clerical & Sales Occupations	Percentage of Total Orders Received	Service Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd	Farming, Fishery, & Related Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd	Processing Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd	Machine Trades Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd	Benchware Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd	Structural Work Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd	Miscellaneous Occupations	% of Total Orders Rec'd
		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%
No. 1	183	5.2	809	23.0	1130	32.2	38	1.1	121	3.4	153	4.4	179	5.1	375	10.7	522	14.9
No. 2	774	2.7	6728	23.4	7552	26.3	328	1.1	602	2.1	1956	6.8	3596	12.5	3043	10.6	4163	14.5
No. 3	1209	5.6	6585	30.4	3712	17.2	2551	11.8	638	2.9	1515	7.0	1101	5.0	2652	12.3	1678	7.8
No. 4	6008	6.4	30942	33.1	17796	19.0	351	.4	4288	4.6	8070	8.6	8039	8.6	5196	5.6	12807	13.7
No. 5	520	4.6	4198	37.3	2236	19.9	221	2.0	200	1.8	560	5.0	756	6.7	1028	9.1	1535	13.6
No. 6	281	3.5	1805	22.4	2242	27.8	672	8.3	110	1.4	220	2.7	191	2.4	916	11.4	1626	20.1
No. 7	4312	5.8	25528	34.1	13023	17.4	2845	3.8	1745	2.3	4092	5.5	4057	5.4	3277	4.4	15938	21.3
No. 8	1074	9.2	3681	31.4	2806	24.0	154	1.3	565	4.8	476	4.1	545	4.6	702	6.0	1708	14.6
No. 9	1821	6.8	4608	17.3	3191	12.0	173	.7	1207	4.5	2969	11.2	5420	20.4	1950	7.3	5253	19.8
No. 10	2664	8.2	7643	23.4	8667	26.6	290	.9	2069	6.3	2138	6.6	1528	4.7	2495	7.6	5125	15.7
No. 11	687	3.9	4133	23.5	3756	21.3	119	.7	864	4.9	2020	11.5	1287	7.3	1927	10.9	2820	16.0
No. 12	510	3.4	4430	29.9	3750	25.3	157	1.1	469	3.2	866	5.8	688	4.6	1918	12.9	2050	13.8
No. 13	5372	18.2	7172	24.3	6256	21.2	196	.7	518	1.8	1240	4.2	1867	6.3	3433	11.7	3406	11.6
No. 14	1244	4.8	6765	25.9	6939	26.5	40	.2	819	3.1	1510	5.8	1865	7.1	1441	5.5	5527	21.1
No. 15	717	3.2	6217	28.0	3422	15.4	379	1.7	1336	6.0	2666	12.0	2742	12.3	1414	6.4	3329	15.0

There are many staffers within the ES/JB ranks that don't believe that their clients are sincere about getting a job. A number of Placement Interviewers in a large midwestern city indicated that the vast majority of the applicants don't really want to work. When one of our field interviewers mentioned that it didn't appear reasonable that people would just sit in the office and not really want a job, the PI said that it was. She mentioned that, particularly during the winter, clients are in the office to stay out of inclement weather conditions.

Other Placement Interviewers said they really tried to help people but only those that were sincere. Sincerity was associated with the number of times the applicant was in the ES. Many individuals among the over three hundred ES/JB staff interviewed could not equate their jobs with their clients' plight. As an applicant said, "Those people (meaning the ES/JB staffer) have forgotten that they have their jobs because of us. . ."

There is no question but that there are many ES/JB staffers possessing the desirable attributes associated with their jobs. Because Job Banks are intrinsically applicant-independent, the ES/JB staffer would do well to increase its services to clients. The hiring decision still resides with the employer but the ES/JB staffer can and does provide an ameliorative role.